

BX

5037

J4

W6

Y848

v. 5

THE

WORKS

OF

JOHN JEWEL, D.D.

BISHOP OF SALISBURY. 1522-1571

EDITED BY

RICHARD WILLIAM JELF, D. D.

CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH,
AND PRINCIPAL OF KING'S COLLEGE LONDON;
FORMERLY FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE.

IN EIGHT VOLUMES.

VOL. V.

OXFORD,

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

MDCCCXLVIII.

THE
DEFENCE OF THE APOLOGY
OF THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

PART II. CONTINUED.

Chap. 10. Divis. 1.

Vol. iv. p.
1.]

MOREOVER, we allow the sacraments of the church, that is to say, certain holy signs and ceremonies, which Christ would we should use, that by them he might set before our eyes the mysteries of our salvation, and might more strongly confirm the faith which we have in his blood, and might seal his grace in our hearts. And these sacraments, together with Tertullian, Origen, Ambrose, Augustine, Hierom, Chrysostom, Basil, Dionysius, and other catholic fathers, we do call *figures, signs, marks, badges¹, prints, copies, forms, seals, signets, similitudes, patterns, representations, remembrances, and memories*. And we make no doubt, together with the same doctors, to say, that these be certain *visible words, seals of righteousness, and tokens of grace*.

M. HARDING.

With what face say ye, that ye allow the sacraments of the church? ^ahave ye not abandoned almost all the sacraments of ^{a Untruth.} For the

¹ [The translator renders the one original word "symbola," by "marks, and badges."]

things that we have left were not the sacraments of the church.

the church? retain ye any mo, by name of the sacraments, than two, baptism, and your supper of the Lord? Of which the one, after that doctrine as it is by you taught and ministered, availeth nothing, but to your further condemnation².....

b Untruth. As shall appear.

The sound and true doctrine which the catholic church holdeth and believeth touching this point, is this: There be seven sacraments, in which, under cover of visible things, the ^b power of God worketh man's health. They be these: baptism, confirmation, the sacrament of the altar, penance, extreme unction, order, wedlock. And these so we call sacraments, as nevertheless we acknowledge the name of sacrament may be extended to many other things. That it be known what a sacrament is, this word *sacrament* signifieth sometime a holy thing, sometime the sign of a holy thing, instituted by God. As it is taken for a sign only, so is it found generally, not only in the new law, but also in the old law. But in the new law these signs after a peculiar and special manner be called *sacraments*, which do not only signify a holy thing, but also do sanctify and make holy those to whom they be adhibited, being such as by institution of Christ contain grace in them, and power to sanctify. Whereof a sacrament is by the best learned divines defined to be a visible sign of

The sound and true doctrine of the sacraments. Seven sacraments.

Sacrament, what it signifieth.

c Untruth. For they are only certain late scholastical sophisters.

invisible grace, so as it bear the image of it, ^c and because of the same. For the plain understanding of this definition, how a sacrament beareth the form, sign, or image of invisible grace, it appeareth evidently in baptism, where washing of the body sheweth the cleansing of the soul. Also in the sacrament of the altar, ^d where the forms of bread and wine outwardly present the spiritual nourishing of the soul. The like appeareth in other sacraments.

Definition of a sacrament.

d Untruth, vain and childish. For no learned father ever said so.

Neither is it a new and strange doctrine to say, that the sacraments of the gospel contain grace in them: for the fathers teach the same not seldom. Chrysostom expounding the mystery of the pool called Bethesda in Hebrew, that was in Jerusalem, saith, "that sick folk were healed at the moving of the water, to the intent men might be brought to understand the virtue of baptism:" "for then was it coming to pass," saith he, "that baptism should be full of power and grace." St. Ambrose in his book *De Sacramentis*³, speaking of baptism, saith, "it is not every water that healeth, but that water healeth which hath the grace of Christ." Cyrillus, upon the foresaid chapter of St. John, saith: "that in baptism it is not water simply that worketh, but when as it hath received the grace of the Holy Ghost." St. Augustine in a sermon saith, "that water in baptism is enriched with a more gift in manner than was the Virgin Mary. For she," saith he, "deserved chastity to herself, this hath given to us sanctifi-

Sermone Dominice Intra octavas Epiphaniæ.

² [Here Harding acknowledges the validity of baptism "for necessity" in the church of England, notwithstanding the omission of

certain ancient "holy rites."]

³ [The genuineness of this work is doubtful.]

cation: she deserved that she sinned not, this that it might purge sins." It is said universally by St. Cyprian, of all the sacraments, that "the fat of God's anointing poureth fulness of grace into the ministerial sanctifications," whereby he meaneth the sacraments.....Yet we mean that they contain grace, and power to sanctify, after such manner of speaking as we say of potions and drinks, prepared for sick persons, that they contain health, to the working whereof they be effectual.....

† In Serm.
de Baptism.
Christi. [app.
xciii.]

And as it is said of the sacraments, that they contain grace, so is it likewise said, that through their virtue, which they have by God's institution, they do not only signify, (as by these defenders' doctrine that seemeth to be their special office,) but also with signification ^e work and cause, as an instrumental cause, the effect of that which they signify⁵.....

Power given
to sacra-
ments to
work that
they signify
by God's
ordnance.

^e Untruth.
See the an-
swer.

After which manner, God hath given to the sacraments of the new testament, that they work the thing signified, through virtue given them by God's ordinance to special effects of grace.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Of the number of the sacraments we shall have more convenient time to speak hereafter. There, gentle reader, I trust, thou shalt see M. Harding's great question easily answered, with what face we say we allow the sacraments of the church. In the mean season it may please thee to weigh these words of cardinal Bessarion, the bishop of Tusculum, one of M. Harding's especial catholic doctors: *Hæc duo sola sacramenta in evangeliiis manifeste tradita* ^{Bessarion de} *legimus*: "These only two sacraments we read to be de- ^{Sacrament.} *livered us plainly in the gospel.*" Here Bessarion nameth, ^{Eucharistiæ.} *not seven sacraments*, as M. Harding doth, but *only two*. Certainly we refuse no sacrament, that ever was either ordained by Christ, or used and practised by the apostles.

[p. 81.]

"Your Lord's supper," saith M. Harding, "availeth you nothing, but to your further condemnation." So must it needs be, because M. Harding saith it shall so be.

⁴ [The Editor confesses, that Jewel's marginal observation appears to him any thing but satisfactory. Yet the bishop can hardly have meant to deny, that the sacraments are means of grace; particularly when it is considered, that he was the authorized reviser of the Articles of 1571, and pro-

bably much engaged in those of 1562. See Art. XXV. "by the which," &c.; and Art. XXVII. "a sign of regeneration, whereby as by an instrument," &c.]

⁵ [Harding here draws an illustration from the touch of Christ, "after which manner," &c.]

These tragical terrors are fit only to fray children: in the day of the Lord each man's work shall appear. The simplest of our people understandeth the nature and meaning of the holy mystery of our *Lord's supper*: and therefore they receive the same together to their great consolation. But in your *lady mass*, the simple people understandeth nothing, heareth nothing, and, saving a few unseemly ceremonies, seeth nothing. And therefore they so seldom communicate, and that only of custom, without any zeal or comfort of conscience, as having no sense or feeling in all these doings. Origen saith: *Nisi circumcisionis reddatur ratio, nutus est, et opus mutum. Pascha, et aliæ solemnitates nutus magis sunt quam veritas. Usque hodie populus (Israel) surdus et mutus est*: "Unless the reasons or causes of circumcision be opened, circumcision is but a *gesture*, and a *dumb kind of work*. The Easter feast, and other like solemnities, are rather *ceremonies*, than the *truth* itself. Even still until this day the people of Israel is deaf and dumb." St. Ambrose saith: *Indignus est Domino qui aliter mysterium celebrat, quam a Christo traditum est. Non enim potest devotus esse, qui aliter præsumit, quam datum est ab autore*: "He is unworthy of the Lord that *ministereth* this sacrament *otherwise* than Christ delivered it. For he cannot be devout, that *presumeth* to use it *otherwise* than it was first delivered from Christ the author⁶."

Origen. in
Jaucam, hom.
5. [iii. 937.]

Ambros. in
1 Cor. xi.
[ii. app. 149.]

These words seem somewhat to touch M. Harding and his company. But here he is contented to allow us the very sacrament, and true use of *baptism*, and that vailable, and of force for the remission of sins. Whereby unadvisedly and unawares he confesseth, that we have the very true catholic church of God. For St. Augustine saith truly: *Baptismus ecclesiæ potest esse extra ecclesiam: munus autem beatæ vitæ non nisi intra ecclesiam invenitur*: "The baptism of the church may be without the church: but the gift of blessed life is not found, but *within the church*." But why he alloweth us this sacrament rather than the other, it were a hard matter to discuss. Neither

De Con. dist.
4, Ecclesia.

⁶ [This work is not by St. Ambrose.]

may we justly require reason of him, that speaketh so much without reason.

Perhaps he will say, *baptism* is but a light sacrament, and may be ministered by any lay person, even by an old woman, or by a girl, so that she speak Latin, and understand not what she say. For otherwise, I trow, her doing may not stand for good. Certainly, whereas M. Harding speaketh of the due form of words, according to Christ's institution, his own doctors tell us, and avouch it for great truth, that if the priest say thus: *Ego te baptizo in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, et diaboli*: that is: "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, *and of the devil*:" or if he say thus, as one ignorant priest sometime said: *Ego te baptizo in nomine Patria, et Filia, et Spirita Sancta*: yet the form of baptism is very good.

De Con. dist.
4. Si non.
[in glossa.]

De Con. dist.
4. Retule-
runt.

But one great fault M. Harding findeth in our doings, for that we have left out a great many *holy rites*, his *chrism*, his *oil*, his *salt*, his *spittle*, and such other like things: and for that we minister this sacrament plainly and simply, as Christ commanded. This objection being of no greater weight, may easily discharge itself, and therefore may pass well without farther answer.

M. Harding saith: "There be seven sacraments, which" (as he saith) "do not only signify a holy thing, but also do sanctify and make holy those to whom they be adhibited, being such as by institution of Christ contain grace in them, and power to sanctify." Here, to leave the rest, it might be demanded, How can *matrimony* sanctify a man, and make him holy? or by what institution of Christ containeth it grace in itself, and power to sanctify? or if it cannot sanctify, nor have such grace, how then can it be called a sacrament?

I grant, the ancient learned fathers, entreating of the sacraments, have often used vehement and great words. It is written in the council of Nice: *Vides aquam? Considera vim divinam quæ in aquis latet. Puta aquam esse plenam ignis divini*: "Seest thou the water? Consider the divine power that lieth hid in the water. Imagine that the

Concil. Nice.
[ii. 888.]

Ambros. de
Sacram. lib.
1. cap. 5. [H.
353.]

water is *full of heavenly fire*⁷." So St. Ambrose: *Spiritus Sanctus descendit, et aquam consecrat. Adest presentia Trinitatis*: "The Holy Ghost cometh down, and halloweth the water. There is the *presence of the Trinity*⁸." So saith Tertullian: *In baptismo tingimur passione Christi*: "In baptism we are *washed with the passion of Christ*⁹." So saith Chrysostom, as M. Harding hath here alleged him: "Baptism is *full of power and grace*." So saith St. Cyprian. So say others.

Tertull. de
Baptismo.
[cap. 19. p.
232.]

All these, and other like vehement speeches M. Harding mitigateth and qualifieth in this wise: "We mean," saith he, "that sacraments contain grace, after such manner of speaking as we say, potions and drinks contain health." That is to say, sacraments verily and indeed *contain not the grace of God*. For "drinks and potions" verily and indeed contain not the health of the patient. In this manner of speech the children of the prophets said to Eli-

2 Kings iv. 40.

Prov. xviii.
21.

John v. 39.

zeus the prophet: *Mors in olla, vir Dei*: "O thou man of God, death is in the pot." So Salomon saith: "Death and life are in the hands of the tongue." So Christ saith unto the Pharisees: "Search the scriptures: for in them you think to have everlasting life." And yet indeed, neither was death in the prophet's pot: nor is life and death in the tongue: nor is life everlasting in the scriptures. Therefore one of M. Harding's school doctors saith: *In sacramentis ecclesiæ specialis virtus passionis Christi continetur, sicut virtus agentis in instrumento*: "The special grace of the passion of Christ is contained in the sacraments of the church, as the power of the worker is contained in the instrument wherewith he worketh."

Johan. de
Parisii, de
potestate
Regia, cap. 2.
[p. 110.]

But indeed it is the soul of man, and not the creature of bread or water, that receiveth the grace of God. We have need of God's grace: these corruptible elements need it not. Without faith of our part, sacraments be not only unprofitable to us, but also hurtful. St. Chrysostom saith: *Ubi est virtus evangelii? in figuris literarum, an intellectu*

Chrysost. in
Matt. Operis
Imperfect.
hom. 43. [vi.
app. 184.]

⁷ [See ante vol. ii. p. 358, note is doubtful.]

⁸ 53.]

⁹ [Tertull. "... passio Domini
"in quam tingimur."]

sensuum? "Where is the power of the gospel? in the forms of the letters, or else in the understanding of the meaning?"

Likewise Bonaventura saith: *Nullo modo dicendum est, quod gratia continetur in ipsis sacramentis essentialiter, tanquam aqua in vase, vel medicina in pyxide. Imo hoc intelligere, est erroneum. Sed dicuntur continere gratiam, quia eam significant:* "We may not in any wise say, that the grace of God is contained substantially and verily in the sacraments, as water is contained in the vessel, or a medicine in the box. For so to say, it were erroneous. But we say, the sacraments contain the grace of God, because they signify the grace of God." Again he saith: *Gratia est in anima, non in signis visibilibus:* "The grace of God is not in the visible signs, but in the soul." And again he saith: *Ad illud quod objicitur, quod remissio peccatorum latet in baptismo, dicendum est, quod hoc intelligitur de latentia signati in signo: quod quidem habet ulteriorem rationem, quam rationem significandi: non tamen essentialiter continendi in se: sed quia ipsum quod signat continetur in anima:* "To the objection that is made, that the remission of sins is hid in baptism, we must answer thus: that it must be taken of the thing signified hid in the sign. Which thing nevertheless hath a farther meaning than to signify: yet not to contain" (the remission of sins) "verily and substantially in itself: but that the grace that is signified thereby is contained in the soul."

The mystical signification that M. Harding hath imagined of his *shews* and *accidents*, that is, that the forms of bread and wine outwardly represent the spiritual nourishing of the soul, is vain and fantastical, without the witness of any ancient doctor or father, confirmed only by the authority of himself. For what manner of feeding is there in these *accidents* and *holy forms*? or how can that thing that feedeth not the body, represent unto us the spiritual feeding of the soul?

The matter is plain enough of itself, and needeth no cavil. The signification and substance of the sacrament is to shew us how we are fed with the body of Christ: that is, that like as material bread feedeth our body, so the

Bonaventur.
in 4. Sent.
dist. 1. [art.
1.] quest. 3.

body of Christ nailed on the cross, embraced and eaten by faith, feedeth the soul. The like representation is also made in the sacrament of baptism: that as our body is washed clean with water, so our soul is washed clean with Christ's blood. Therefore St. Augustine saith: *Nisi sacramenta similitudinem quandam earum rerum, quarum sacramenta sunt, haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent*: "If sacraments had not a certain likeness and representation of the things whereof they be sacraments, then indeed they were no sacraments."

Augustin.
epist. 23.
[ii. 267.]

This representation Rabanus Maurus expoundeth thus: *Quia panis corporis cor confirmat, ideo ille congruenter corpus Christi nuncupatur: et quia vinum sanguinem operatur in carne, ideo refertur ad sanguinem*: "Because" (not the accidents or forms of bread, but) "*bread itself confirmeth the heart of the body*, therefore it is conveniently called the body of Christ: and because wine worketh blood in the flesh, therefore it hath relation unto the blood."

Rabanus, [de
Cler. Inst. et
Cler. Eccl.]
lib. i. cap.
31. [tom. vi.
p. 12.]

Druthmar, in
Matt. xxvi.
[p. 934.]

So likewise saith Druthmarus: *Vinum lætificat, et sanguinem auget, et ideo non inconvenienter sanguis Christi per hoc figuratur*: (not the accidents or forms of wine, but) "*wine itself rejoiceth the heart, and increaseth blood*: and therefore the blood of Christ conveniently is thereby signified."

M. Harding, for that he cannot utterly deny it, the matter being so plain, is therefore contented to grant that the sacrament is *the figure of Christ's body*. But to help out, and to shift the matter, he hath devised such a strange kind of *figure*, as seldom hath been heard before. Notwithstanding the holy learned fathers speak plainly and simply, and use no kind of such glosses. St. Hierom saith: *Ad tropicam intelligentiam sermo referatur. Quando dico, tropicam, doceo verum non esse quod dicitur, sed allegorie nubilo figuratum*: "Let that saying be expounded by a *figure*. When I say a *figure*, I say, the thing that is spoken is *not true indeed, but figured* under the cloud of an allegory."

Hieron. ad-
versus Rufi-
num. [lib. i.
iv. pt. 2. 381.]

Chrysost. in
Genesin.
hom. 35. [iv.
357.]

Likewise Chrysostom saith: *Audisti fuisse figuram. Ne ergo mirare, neque omnia require in typo. Neque enim*

typus esset, si omnia, quæ veritati accidunt, haberentur :
 “Ye have heard that it was a *figure*. Therefore marvel
 not : and being a *figure*, require not all things to agree.
 For otherwise it were no *figure*.”

So likewise St. Augustine saith : *In principio cavendum est, ne figuratam locutionem ad literam accipias. Ad hoc enim pertinet quod ait apostolus,.....Litera occidit. Cum enim figurate dictum sic accipitur, tanquam proprie dictum sit, carnaliter sapitur : neque ulla mors animæ congruentius appellatur :* “First of all, thou must take heed that thou take not a *figurative speech according to the letter, or sound of the words*. For that is it whereof St. Paul saith, ‘The letter killeth.’ For when the thing that is spoken under a *figure* is so taken, as if it were plainly spoken, there is a *fleshly understanding*. Neither is there any thing that may better be called the death of the soul.” All this, and much more to like purpose, thou mayest find in my former Reply to M. Harding.

Augustin. de
Doctrina
Christiana,
lib. iii. cap. 5.
[1. 47.]

Artic. 12.
[supra vol.
iii. 133.]

St. Hierom saith : “When I say, It is a *figure*, then I say, It is not the truth.” Chrysostom saith : “If it were the truth itself, it were no *figure*.” St. Augustine saith : “Beware thou expound not a *figurative speech* according to the sound of the *letter*,” as if it were the truth indeed. “*For that is the death of the soul*.” Thus the holy fathers have taught us to find a difference between a *figure* and the *truth* itself.

Another phantasy M. Harding hath found : “That the sacraments of the new law work the thing itself that they signify, through virtue,” as he saith, “given unto them by God’s ordinance, to special effects of grace.” This, as I said, is but a phantasy¹⁰. For the *sacraments of the old law and of the new*, in truth and substance, are all one. St. Paul saith : *Omnes eundem cibum comederunt :* “The fathers in the old law did all eat *the same meat*,” that is to say, the same Christ that we eat. St. Hilary saith : *Sub*

1 Cor. x. 3.

Hilar. in Psal.
lxvii. [p. 195.]

¹⁰ [The Editor cannot refrain from pointing out the discrepancy between this assertion of bishop Jewel, and others of his statements (such as will be found infr. p. 11) —indeed some of the Articles of our church which were revised by him in 1571.]

nube fuerunt,.....et Christo, aquam petra præbente, potati sunt: "They were under the cloud, and were drenched with Christ, the Rock giving them water." Likewise saith

Leo de Nativitate Domini, serm. 3. [i. 151.]

Leo: *Mysteria pro temporum ratione variata sunt: quum fides, qua vivimus, nulla fuerit ætate diversa*: "The sacraments are altered according to the diversity of the times. But the faith, whereby we live, in all ages was ever one."

Augustin. in Johan. tract. 26. [iii. pt. 2. 498.]

Likewise St. Augustine: *Sacramenta illa fuerunt, in signis diversa: in rebus quæ significabantur, paria*: "These things were sacraments, in the outward tokens, divers: but in the things tokened, all one with ours."

Augustin. in Psal. lxxiii. [iv. 769.]

M. Harding will reply: St. Augustine saith: *Sacramenta novi testamenti dant salutem*: "The sacraments of the new testament give salvation." But who can better expound St. Augustine's meaning than St. Augustine himself? He addeth immediately: *Cum ergo jam teneas promissa, quid quæris promittentia salvatorem? Hoc dico, teneas promissa: non quod jam acceperimus vitam æternam, sed quod jam Christus venerit, qui per prophetas prænuntiabatur*: "Wherefore, seeing thou hast the promises" (of the coming of Christ) "already performed, what seekest thou the things that promised the Saviour? I say, Thou hast the promises already performed: not for that we have already received everlasting life, but for that Christ is already come, that was promised by the prophets." Therefore when St. Augustine saith: "Our sacraments give salvation," his meaning is this: Our sacraments teach us that salvation is already come into the world.

M. Harding, fol. 330 b.


Addition. ☞ M. Harding. "So then *dare* is to teach, *Addition.* and *salus* is salvation come into the world. Here is gay gear for wantons, to dally with words in matter of our salvation." *The answer.* Oh what proper sport ye make yourself with this *gay gear*, M. Harding! "*Dare*" (you say) "is not Latin to teach." I answer you, neither is *dare* Latin to contain. But thus I say: *Sacraments give grace so far forth as sacraments be able to give grace.* Your own Bonaventura saith: *Non est aliquo modo dicendum, &c.*: "We may not in any wise say, that the grace of God is really contained in the sacraments, as water is contained

Bonaventur. in 4. Sent. dist. 1. [art. 1.] quæst. 3. c.

Dicuntur continere gratiam, quia ipsam significant.

in a vessel, or a medicine in a box. For so to take it, it were an error. But we say, Sacraments contain the grace of God, because they represent or signify the grace of God."

Thus far forth, M. Harding, sacraments are able to give grace. And therefore your school doctors thus commonly define a sacrament: *Sacramentum est invisibilis gratiæ visibile signum*: "A sacrament is a visible sign of grace invisible." As for the meaning of St. Augustine, I made it plain by other his words immediately following, which you guilefully have dissembled. For thus he saith: "Thou hast the promises already performed: not for that we have already received everlasting life, but for that Christ is already come, that was promised by the prophets." And although the death of Christ be already passed, yet is it laid lively and freshly before our eyes in the ministration of the sacraments. St. Ambrose saith: *In baptismo cruci-*

figimus in nobis Filium Dei: "In baptism we crucify in ourselves the Son of God." St. Chrysostom saith: *In mysteriis mors Christi perficitur*: "The death of Christ is wrought in the mysteries." Thus the grace of God is given unto us in the sacraments, because it is represented and laid before us in the sacraments. Thus saith St. Augustine, thus saith St. Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, and other holy fathers. They were no wantons: neither did they, nor do we dally, as you say, with these things. We use them humbly with obedience and reverence, as the instruments of the grace of God." 

Thus St. Augustine saith in another place: *Illa fuerunt promissiones rerum complendarum: hæc sunt indicia completarum*: "The sacraments of the old law were promises of such things as should afterward be accomplished: our sacraments of the new law are tokens that the same promises be already accomplished. Thus the holy fathers say: "The sacraments of the new law work salvation:" because they teach us that our salvation is already wrought. So Bonaventura saith of the sacraments of the old testament: *Mundare dicebantur: id est, mundatum ostendebant*: "They were said to make a man clean, because they shewed or signified that a man was made clean."

Ambros. de
Pœnitent. lib.
2. cap. 2. [il.
418.]

Chrysost. in
Acta, hom.
21. [ix. 176 c.]

Augustin.
contra Faust.
lib. 19. cap.
14. [viii. 320.]

Bonaventur.
in 4. Sent.
dist. 1. [Dub.
6.]
In Proœmio.

M. Harding,
fol. 330 b.

Addition. ¶ M. Harding. “What then? will it follow, *Addition.*

that because our sacraments do shew that Christ is already come, therefore our sacraments give no grace? &c. ‘He that eateth Christ’s flesh, sheweth his death,’ saith St. Paul: ‘and he that eateth my flesh,’ saith Christ, ‘hath life everlasting.’ Mark how our having of life goeth together with our shewing of Christ’s death: you divide these matters, and make Christ’s sacraments only to be shows.” *The answer.* You have misalleged St. Paul, M. Harding: these are not his words: look better on your books, and see your error. If I had some part of your eloquence, I could cry out, as you do: “Falsifiers and corrupters of God’s word.” St. Paul saith not: “He that eateth Christ’s flesh, sheweth his death.” You deal untruly. Thus he saith: “As often as you shall eat this bread, and drink this cup, you shall shew forth the Lord’s death.” The *bread* of the sacrament is one thing, M. Harding: and the *flesh of Christ* is another. The *bread* entereth only into the bodily mouth: *Christ’s flesh* entereth only into the soul. Without eating of that *bread* of the sacrament we may be saved: without eating of *Christ’s flesh* we can never be saved. St. Augustine saith precisely: *Qui non sumit carnem Christi, non habet vitam: et qui eam sumit, habet vitam, et eam utique æternam*: “He that receiveth not the *flesh of Christ*, hath not life: and he that receiveth the same hath life, and that for ever.”

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
26. [iii. pt. 2.
500.]

In eodem
tract.

Again he saith: “The sacrament is received of some unto life, of some unto destruction: but the thing itself” (that is, *the flesh of Christ*) “whereof the sacrament is a sacrament, is received of all men unto life, and of no man to destruction, whosoever shall be partaker of it.”

Thus you see, M. Harding, there is great difference between the *bread* of the sacrament, and the *flesh of Christ*. Ye were to blame therefore so to falsify St. Paul, and to place the one instead of the other. We divide these things, because God himself had so divided them. But you indiscreetly mingle and confound these things together, whereas indeed they should be divided: and so ye wilfully deceive your simple reader. ¶

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 11. *Divis. 1.*

att. iv. p.

And we do expressly pronounce, that in the Lord's supper there is *truly* given¹¹ unto the *believing the body and blood of our Lord, the flesh of the Son of God, which quickeneth our souls, the meat that cometh from above, the food* of immortality, of grace, truth, and life¹²: and that the same supper is the communion of the body and blood of Christ: by the partaking whereof we be revived, strengthened, and fed unto immortality: and whereby we are joined, united, and incorporate unto Christ, that we may abide in him, and he in us.

M. HARDING.

att. xxiv.

e sacra-
mentaries?
rd's sup-
r.

What ye pronounce of this high sacrament, the wise and careful tenderers of their souls will be right ware thereof. Of you, and such as ye be, because your doctrine is ^a but of a corner of the world in respect of the universal church, Christ hath given us a watchword, *Nolite credere*: "Believe them not." In your the Lord's supper, celebrated by the ministers of your own creation, ^b there is not given the body and blood of our Lord, neither to the believing nor to the unbelieving. For at the celebration of your schismatical supper, no ^b consecration being done, ^b nor faith of the church, ^b nor right intention had, ^b nor Christ's institution observed, what deliver ye to your communicants but ^b a piece of bread and a sip of wine? Neither is it ^b your will it be more or better. At the supper of our Lord, ministered in the catholic church by priests rightly consecrated, and as it hath been accustomed in Christ's church, there is the true and whole body of our Lord and Saviour given and received, be the receivers believing or ^b not believing¹³.....For when Christ gave this sacrament to his disciples at his last supper, after that he had consecrated the same, saying, "Take ye, eat ye, this is my body;" Judas the traitor, as the ^c fathers teach, received his true body no less than Peter, Andrew, John, or James did: though they to their salvation, he to his damnation.

das receiv-
the true
dy of
rist no
ss than the
ostiles,
att. xxvi.

^a In respect of this corner, the church of Rome were a simple corner.
^b Untruths joined with heathenish blasphemies.
^c Untruth.
Read the answer.

^c Untruth.
Read the answer.
Chrys. Hom. de prodiction. Judæ.
Aug. in Ps. x.

¹¹ [Apol. Lat. "exhiberi."]

¹² [Apol. Lat. "gratiam, veritatem, vitam."]

¹³ [Harding adds, "Albeit I see not how we may justly call Christian people not believing. For the truth of the inward thing of this holy sacrament which is

our Lord's body, is made present by the omnipotency of his word, and dependeth not of the receiver's belief. Neither is his precious body present or absent according to the belief or unbelief, worthiness or unworthiness of the receivers."]

d Untruth.
For we call
the sign the
sign, and the
truth the
truth.

Now it is to be noted how this defender in this long sentence affecteth a certain holy (as it were) and solemn eloquence, and useth a religious amplification of words to set forth the sacrament, as though he had a reverent and a godly opinion of it: whereas indeed he taketh it ^d but for a poor sign or token, as their doctor Zuinglius doth. But such is their craft, to purchase them credit among the people..... Thus offer they to the unlearned their fair cups full of venom, anointing the brims with honey of sweet and holy words, the rather to poison them. Such complaint maketh the grave father St. Hilary against the Arians of his time: *Ingerunt nobis primum nomina veritatis, ut virus falsitatis introeat. Bonum in ore est, ut de corde malum subeat:* De Trinit. 6. [p. 882.]

e O marvelous horrible heresy: what doctor or father ever named your real presence?

“First,” saith he, “they thrust me forth words of truth, that the venom of falsehood may enter in. Good is in their mouth, that out from the heart may evil proceed.” And among all these words (he meaneth the Arians’ confession of their faith) I hear nowhere by them said, *Deum Dei Filium*: “God the Son of God.” Right so among all these fair words concerning the sacrament, ^e we hear never a whit said of the real presence of Christ’s body. Epiphanius noteth the like craft in Arius, and so doth St. Augustine in the Pelagians. Nestorius likewise spake honourably in many places of Christ and his mother. But nowhere would he call her *Θεοτόκον*, that is, the mother of God. The Jews also, as we find in the Gospel, called our Saviour Jesus the carpenter’s son, confessed Mary to be his mother, James, Joseph, Simon and Jude his brothers, and that his sisters were among them, (by whom his kinsfolk are to be understood,) but the Son of God they would not acknowledge him, nor in that degree honour him. Better than to those Jews can I not compare these defenders, who speak honourably of our Lord’s body and blood in their supper; ^f but that his body is really, that is, verily in the sacrament of the altar, that will not the devil, who reigneth in their hearts, suffer their mouths to utter.”

f Neither did any doctor or father ever say that Christ’s body is really and verily in the sacrament.

Contra Arianitas, H. res. 69.
De gratia Christi, contra Pelagianum et Cælest. Lib. i. cap. Matt. xiii.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

M. Harding telleth us, “We deliver unto the faithful nothing else but a piece of bread and a sip of wine: that we have neither intention nor consecration: that our fair cups be full of venom: that our supper is schismatical, and our eloquence is hypocritical: that our doctrine is heretical: that we are like to the Pelagians, to the Nestorians, to the Arians, and to the Jews: and that the devil reigneth in our hearts.” If the truth of God were evermore joined with vain speech, then might M. Harding be able easily to win the price. He saith, “Our doctrine is but in a corner of the world, and that therefore Christ hath given

this watchword of us, Believe them not." Howbeit, if he would advisedly consider the matter, and look well about him, he should find that so many kingdoms, and countries, and commonweals as this day profess the gospel of Christ, would make a good large corner in the church of God. Certainly in respect thereof Rome itself were a very poor corner.

Unto whom Christ specially pointed when he said these words, "Believe them not," because it is a prophecy, it is hard to judge. But it is very likely he meant Antichrist, "that man of sin, the child of destruction, that advanceth himself above all that is called God." Verily Chrysostom thereof saith thus: *Non dico, si dixerint vobis, Ecce in hæreticis ecclesiis illis, vel in illis apparuit Christus: sed etiam si in ipsis veris ecclesiis, quæ Dei sunt, id est, domus vestræ, dixerint vobis Christum apparuisse, nolite eis credere dicentibus ista de me: quia non est digna divinitatis meæ notitia hæc: ostendens per hæc, quomodo ex ipsis ecclesiis veris frequenter exeunt seductores. Propterea nec ipsis omnino credendum est, nisi ea dicant, vel faciant, quæ convenientia sint scripturis:* "I say not, If they tell you, Behold Christ hath appeared in these or in these churches of heretics: but if they shall say unto you, that Christ hath appeared *in the very true churches* that are of God, that is to say, that are your houses, believe them not if they say thus of me: for this is no worthy knowledge of my divinity: by these he sheweth, *how that out of the very true churches oftentimes come forth deceivers.* Therefore we may not believe, no not them, unless they speak or do those things *that are agreeable to the scriptures.*"

² Thess. ii. 3.
Chrys. in O-
pere Imperf.
hom. 49. [vi.
app. 209.]

Verily, howsoever M. Harding will shift this matter, the plain words seem rather to touch him and his company, than either Luther, or Zuinglius, or any other¹⁴. For they can point with their fingers, and say, "Here is Christ," and "There is Christ." Behold in this pyx are three Christs: in that five: in that seven: in that mo. There-

¹⁴ [Harding, in his Detection, here gives an account of the different sects of protestants, who say, "here is Christ," and "there is Christ." He ends with "one Brown at London, with his unspotted congregation, otherwise called puritans." p. 332, 333.]

fore it is likely that Christ giveth us this special watchword of them and such others, "Believe them not."

Here M. Harding maketh much ado about *consecration*, and yet are not his fellows well agreed what to make of their own *consecration*. Gabriel saith: *Christus potuit sine verbo tanquam verus Deus, substantiam panis et vini consecrare: vel potuit verba quedam secreto proferre, et per illa consecrare: vel, per hæc verba, Hoc est corpus meum, consecrare potuit: vel, potuit prius consecrare, et postea distribuere: vel, primum distribuere, et postea consecrare. Quid autem horum fecerit, ex sacris scripturis non constat*: "Christ, as being very God, might consecrate the substance of bread and wine *without word*: or else he might speak certain words *in secret*, and by them consecrate: or else he might consecrate by these words, 'This is my body:' or else he might *first* consecrate, and *after* deliver: or else *first* deliver, and *after* consecrate. But which of all these he did indeed, by the holy scriptures it appeareth not¹⁵." Cardinal Bessarion saith, that in the Latin church *consecration* is wrought by the *words of Christ*: in the Greek church by other *prayers* that follow afterward. Catharinus, intreating purposely hereof, saith: "Christ *consecrated not with the same words* that are now used in the mass, 'This is my body.'" ¹⁶Durandus saith: "Christ consecrated by his *divine power*, and after consecration said, 'This is my body.'" Petrus Alliacensis yieldeth this reason hereof: *Quia, nisi ante fuisset corpus Christi, Christus non vere dixisset, Hoc est corpus meum*: "If it had not been Christ's body before, Christ *could not have said truly*, 'This is my body.'" It is concluded in a book called Antididagma, lately set forth by the chapter of Cologne, that the bare words of Christ's institution, without the words of the *canon* of the mass, are not sufficient to work *consecration*. Bonaventura saith: "To have the true

Gabriel Biel. lectio 26. [leg. 36. fol. lxxxiii.]

Bessar. de Sacr. Eucharistie. [p. 1.]

Catharinus de Consecratione.

Durand. lib. 4. de sexta parte Canonis. [sect. 15.]
Petr. de Alliac. in 4 sen. qu. 5. [art. 1. fol. 250 D.]

Antididagma. [fol. lxxiii.]

Bonaventura in 4 senten. dist. 8. qu. 2.

¹⁵ [The substance of this passage will be found in Biel. lect. 36.]

¹⁶ [The Editor has not succeeded in finding this treatise; but it appears that this was one of two books of Catharinus prohibited in

the Index Tridentinus on account of his holding, that Christ did not consecrate with the same words. See Scriptores Ordinis Prædicator. ii. 149.]

form of consecration, we must seek not to the gospel of Christ, but to the canon ¹⁵."

Howbeit thereof groweth a great inconvenience, that Christ and his apostles, for that they had not the words of the *canon*, had therefore no *consecration*. Again Bonaventura saith, that these words *novi* and *æterni testamenti*, are not of the substance of *consecration*; but are used only as a furniture. Johannes Scotus saith: *Quod ergo est consecrationis? Dico, quod sacerdos intendens facere, quod facit ecclesia, legens distincte verba canonis, a principio usque ad finem, vere conficit: nec est tutum alicui, reputare se valde peritum in scientia sua, et dicere, volo uti præcise istis verbis pro consecratione*: "The matter being so doubtful, what then is your counsel? I say, that the priest intending to do whatsoever the church doth, and reading the words of the *canon* distinctly and plainly, from the beginning to the end, doth verily *consecrate*. Neither is it good for a man to reckon himself very skilful in his knowledge, and to say, *I will use precisely these, or these words, to work consecration*." Where also these words are specially noted in the margin: *Nota, quod de hac materia, doctor nihil hic asserit, sed probabiliter aliquid dicens, sub dubio relinquit*: "Here mark, that touching this matter (*of consecration*) the doctor *avoucheth nothing*: but speaking somewhat by the way of likelihood, *he leaveth the whole matter under doubt*." In the end Scotus uncertainly and doubtfully concludeth thus: *Unde dicunt aliqui, quod forma Græcorum, et forma nostra, et quæcunque scripta in evangelis, sufficiens est ad consecrationem*: "Whereof some say thus, that the *form of words* that the Greeks use, and the *form that we use, and any form else written in the Gospels*, is sufficient to *consecration*." The like certainty Bonaventura teacheth us: for thus he endeth: *De hoc [leg. hac, scil. forma,] est utilius dubitare: quis enim potest scire, utrum evangelistæ, aut apostolus ipse intenderint describere formam? Igitur melius est, hic pie dubitare, quam præsump-*

Scotus in 4
senten. dist.
8. quest. 2.

Scotus in 4
senten. dist.
8. quest. 2.

Bonaventura
in 4 senten.
dist. 8. [part.
2. in præm.]

¹⁵ [Bonav. in 4. sent. dist. 8. part. 2. qu. 2. conclus. "Accipi-
" enda est igitur forma a canone, " quia, &c. Accipienda est igitur
" ab ipsis apostolis, non ab evan-
" gelistis," &c.]

tuose definire: “ *Hereof it is best to stand in doubt.* For who can tell, whether the evangelists or the apostle Paul himself meant to write us the form of *consecration*? Therefore in this point it is better *soberly to doubt*, than presumptuously to determine.”

By these few, good Christian reader, thou mayest see the ground and certainty of M. Harding’s doctrine. He saith, “ We have no consecration, for that we lack a thing.” But what thing it should be, he and his fellows cannot tell.

Howbeit, indeed we use the same words that Christ used. If Christ and his apostles consecrated, then do we undoubtedly likewise consecrate. The want that he findeth in us, he may also find in them. St. Augustine saith:

Augustin. in
Joh. tract. 80.
[iii. pt. 2.
703.]
Orig. in Matt.
cap. 15. [iii.
499.]

Accedat verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum: “ Join the word of God unto the element, (or outward creature,) and thereby is made a sacrament.” Origen saith: *Panis sanctificatur per verbum Dei, et obsecrationem*: “ The bread is consecrate by the word of God, and by prayer ¹⁶.” St.

Ambr. De iis
qui initian-
tur, cap. 9.
[ii. 339.]

Ambrose saith: *Ante benedictionem verborum celestium, alia species nominatur: post consecrationem, corpus (Christi) significatur*: “ Before the blessing of the heavenly words, it is called another kind: after consecration, the body of Christ is signified ¹⁷.”

M. Harding,
332, b.

Addition. ☞ M. Harding. “ Christ was a priest, and consecrated as a priest, as St. Cyprian and St. Hierom do witness, that as Melchisedech in foreshewing the figure of Christ had done, *Panem et vinum offerens, ipse quoque veritatem sui corporis, et sanguinis representaret*: ‘ Christ himself also should make present the truth of his body and blood.’ Christ made his apostles also ministerial priests, saying, ‘ Do this (wherein is contained, Make this) in my remembrance.’” *The answer.* Is *representare* Latin to *make present*, M. Harding? What grammarian ever taught you so to say? or what *making* find you in this word? As you tender your credit, tell us who ever spake such Latin, or out of such Latin made such English? If you can shew us no better author, we must needs think it

¹⁶ [Origen . . . και τὸ ἁγιαζόμενον βρῶμα διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ και ἐντεύξεως . . .]

¹⁷ [See vol. ii. 324: and note ²³.]

is your own. I grant the old *civilians* have sometimes used this word *repræsentare* in some such meaning: as when they say, *repræsentare legatum, repræsentare pretium, repræsentare pecuniam*. But in this new sense that you have imagined, I trow, M. Harding, they never used it. Howbeit we speak not now of *civilians*, we speak of *divines*. Columella saith: *Repræsentare faciem veri maris*: “To represent the sight of the very sea.” Curtius saith: *Urbis dirutæ species repræsentabatur animis*: “The image of the defaced city was represented to their minds.” Will you hereof conclude, that the *very sea*, or the *very defaced city*, was made present and stood really and verily before their eyes? The strangeness of your dealing, M. Harding, forceth me to use mo words than might seem needful.

The place of St. Hierom is plain against you. Thus he saith: *Ut quomodo in præfiguratione ejus Melchisedec summi Dei sacerdos panem, et vinum offerens, fecerat, ipse quoque veritatem sui corporis, et sanguinis repræsentaret*:

Columel. lib. 8. cap. 17.
Quint. Curtius, lib. 3. [cap. 10.]

Hier. in Matt. cap. 26. [iv. 128.]

“That, as Melchisedec, the priest of the highest God, had done, offering bread and wine in figure of him, even so he himself should represent the truth of his body and blood.” As Melchisedec by *bread and wine represented the truth of Christ’s body and blood*, so did Christ also *represent* the same. And if Christ, as you say, *made it present*, then did Melchisedec also, by St. Hierom’s judgment, *make it present*. But when we speak of sacraments, *representing* is nothing else but *shewing* or *signifying*. So Tertullian saith: *Christus non reprobavit panem, quo ipsum corpus suum repræsentavit [repræsentat]*: Christ refused not bread, by which he represented his very body.” Which words afterward in plainer sort he expoundeth thus:


Tertull. contra Marcion. lib. 1. [14. p. 372.]

Christus accepit panem, et corpus suum illum fecit, dicendo: hoc est corpus meum: hoc est, figura corporis mei: “Christ took the bread, and made it his body, saying, ‘This is my body,’ that is to say, This is a figure of my body.”

Tertull. contra Marcion. lib. 4. [c. 40. p. 458.]

But that *repræsentare* should signify either to *make Christ’s body*, or to *make it present*, no man, I trow, ever durst to say it but M. Harding.

In these words, *Do this, you say is contained, Make this.*

Doth Christ bid you to *make this* indeed, M. Harding? And what *this*, I pray you, would you make? Ye will say, *Christ's body*. But Christ's *body*, as we believe, is *made already*, and needeth no new *making* at your hands. But you will say, *Ye make Christ in remembrance of Christ*. All this is mere folly. For every way ye tell us, *Ye make Christ*. Presume not, M. Harding, to *make* him that made you. It is enough for your *Stella Clericorum* to say, *Qui creavit me, dedit mihi potestatem creandi se: sacerdos est creator Creatoris sui*: "He that *made* me hath given me power to make him: a priest is his *Maker's maker*¹⁸." But God hath made hell-fire to the destruction of all them that yield their mouths to speak such blasphemy. Christ never bade you to *make his body*, as you imagine. His words be plain: you have untruly reported them: *Do this in my remembrance*: *Do this*, saith Christ: he saith not, *Make this*. And what is meant by this *doing*, who can better teach us than St. Paul? Thus he saith: "As often as you shall eat this bread or drink this cup, you shall publish the Lord's death until he come." This is the *doing*, that Christ commanded, and this is it, that you have to do. 

1 Cor. xi. 26.

Another quarrel that M. Harding picketh to us is this, *that we have no intention or mind to consecrate*. But how long hath M. Harding been a wizard? Or, who made him so privy to our *intentions*? St. Paul saith, "No man can tell what is in man, but the spirit of man that is within him." These follies are answered at large in my former

Art. 1. Divis.
12. [vol. i. p.
223.]

Summa Angel.
Euch.
rist. i. 26.
Gerson in
Floretum, l. 4.
[xcvi. col. 3.]

Reply to M. Harding. Verily by the late doctors of that side, the priest may have *intention* to consecrate the one half of the host and not the other; or, having thirteen hosts¹⁹, he may have *intention* to consecrate but twelve. And thereof groweth a great question, when he cometh to the reckoning, and seeth his error, which of all that whole company of hosts shall go unconsecrate. Yea, abbot

¹⁸ [Stella Clericorum, "Iste
"qui creavit me dedit mihi creare
"se; qui creavit me sine me, crea-
"tur mediante me." This book
went through thirteen editions be-

tween A. D. 1488 and 1515.]

¹⁹ [Gerson mentions 15. Con-
cerning Floretus, see vol. ii. 386.
note 86.]

Panormitane saith: *Etiamsi sacerdos celebret, ut Deus per-* Panormit. de
dat aliquem, tamen [leg. *dic quod*] (*bene* [deest]) *consecrat* Celebr. Miss.
 [leg. *conficit*]: “Notwithstanding the priest say mass with Quidam.
intention, that God would destroy some man, yet doth he [in 3 lib. ex-
 consecrate nevertheless.” Into such toys these men throw tra, tom. iii.
 themselves with their fond *intentions*. fol. 209. col. 3. b.]

Our *intention* is, to do, that Christ hath taught us to do, Matt. xxvi. 26.
 that is, to minister the holy sacrament *in remembrance of*
him; and, as St. Paul saith, “to shew forth and to publish” 1 Cor. xi. 26.
 the Lord’s death until he come.” And to this purpose one
 of M. Harding’s own doctors saith: *Non sufficit intentio* Pupilla Oculi,
consecrandi absolute: sed oportet ut sit conformis intentioni de Euchar.
sacramentum instituentis: “Absolutely the *intention* to con- cap. 5.
 secrate is not sufficient; but it must be answerable unto the
intention of Christ that ordained the sacrament.”

“At the supper of our Lord,” saith M. Harding, “min-
 istered in the catholic church, by priests rightly consecrate,
 there is the true and whole body of our Lord and Saviour
 given and received; be the receivers believing or not
 believing.” This is no great marvel in M. Harding’s doc-
 trine. For they of his side say: “*Si* [al. *si non*] *dicatur* De Conse-
quod mus sumat corpus Christi, non est magnum inconve- crat. dist. 2.
niens: If it be said, that a mouse receiveth the body of Qui bene: in
Christ, it is no great inconvenience.” And Alexander of Glossa.
 Hales, a notable school doctor, saith, though in more un-
 seemly and grosser wise: *Si canis, vel porcus deglutiret* Alex. Hales.
hostiam consecratam integram, non video, quare corpus Do- par. 4. quest.
mini non simul trajiceretur in ventrem canis, vel porci: 45. memb. 1.
 “If [art. 2.]
 a dog or a sow should happen to swallow down the whole
 host, being consecrate, I see no reason but the body of our
 Lord may pass withal into the belly of the dog or of the
 sow.”


But St. Augustine saith far otherwise: *Hoc est mandu-* Augustin. in
care illam escam, et illum potum bibere, in Christo manere, Johan. tract.
et Christum [leg. *illum*] *manentem in se habere*: “This is 26. [iii. pt. 2.
 the eating of that meat, and the drinking of that drink, that 501.]
 a man dwell in Christ, and have Christ dwelling in him.”

Likewise Origen saith: *Est verus cibus, quem nemo* Orig. in Matt.
malus potest edere. Etenim si malus posset edere corpus cap. 15. [iii. 500.]

Domini, non scriberetur, Qui edit hunc panem, vivet in æternum: “The body of Christ is the true food, which no evil man can eat. For if the evil man could eat the body of our Lord, it should not be written, ‘He that eateth this bread shall live for ever’²⁰.” But hereof we have spoken

Art. 23. [sup. more at large in the former Reply to M. Harding. vol. iii. p. 455.]

M. Harding, fol. 333. b.

Addition.  M. Harding. “You have foully corrupted this place, M. Jewel. Origen speaketh not of the sacrament in those words, nor of the sacramental eating, &c. M. Jewel hath so mangled these words, that the sense is clean altered. For instead of *verbum caro factum*, he hath placed the body of Christ, referring it to the sacrament, &c. He hath changed *edere verbum factum carnem* into *edere corpus Domini*. And so, whereas Origen meant that evil men cannot eat spiritually and effectually the divinity of Christ, M. Jewel hath taught him to say, that an evil man cannot in the sacrament eat Christ’s body.”

And so M. Harding awaked out of his dream.

The answer. Will you lead your whole life in wrangling, M. Harding? and will you never learn to deal plainly? “Origen,” you say, “speaketh nothing in this place of the sacrament.” I grant you. Neither do I in this place speak one word of the sacrament. I speak only of Christ’s body, that is represented by the sacrament. *That body* (I say) *cannot be eaten by the wicked*. So saith Origen: so say others the learned fathers.

As for that you speak of, *mangling the words, and altering the meaning*, it is too childish to be answered. You say, “Origen meant, that the wicked man cannot eat the divinity of Christ spiritually.” Be it so. Will you then say, that the wicked man may eat the divinity or the godhead of Christ corporally, with his bodily mouth, and with his teeth? Is this the divinity ye have learned at Louvain? Season it better, M. Harding: it is unsavoury. Origen in

²⁰ [Origen in Matt. cap. 15. Πολλὰ δ’ ἂν καὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγοιτο τοῦ Λόγου, ὃς γέγονε σὰρξ καὶ ἀληθινὴ βρώσις, ἣν τινα ὁ φαγὼν πάντως ἕξηται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, οὐδενὸς δηναμένου φαύλου ἐσθίειν αὐτήν.]

εἰ γὰρ οἷόν τε ἦν ἔτι φαῦλον μένοντα ἐσθίειν τὸν γενόμενον σάρκα, λόγον ὄντα καὶ ἄρτον ζῶντα, οὐκ ἂν ἐγγέγραπτο, ὅτι πᾶς ὁ φαγὼν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον ἕξηται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.]

this place first speaketh of the *sacrament of Christ's body*. Afterward he speaketh of Christ's *body* itself, and saith, *that no evil man can receive it*. And to that purpose he allegeth the words of Christ in St. John, "Whoso eateth of this bread shall live for ever." Leave this lightness, M. Harding. Here is neither *mangling of words, nor altering of sentence*. ➡

The *heretical doctrine* that M. Harding talketh of, with all the whole furniture of hypocritical eloquence, we may safely send home from whence it came. And I doubt nothing, but he can well tell how to use it.

As for Pelagius, Arius, and Nestorius, we defy them utterly and detest them, as we do also all other sorts and sects of heresies.

Of the sacraments of Christ we do both speak and think reverently, and as it becometh us, and according to the holy scriptures. We say, that a *creature* is a *creature*; that a *sacrament* is a *sacrament*, and not God. We say with St. Augustine, "The sacrament is not our Lord, but the bread of our Lord²¹." Again St. Augustine saith, *In sacramentis videndum est, non quid sint, sed quid significant* [l. *ostendant*]: "In sacraments we must consider, *not what they be in deed, but what they signify*."

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
59. [iii. pt. 2.
663.]

Contra Maxi-
min. lib. 3.
cap. 22. [viii.
725.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 11. *Divis. 2.*

Besides this, we acknowledge there be two sacraments, which we judge properly ought to be called by this name: that is to say, *baptism and the sacrament of thanksgiving*. For thus many we see were delivered and sanctified by Christ, and well allowed of the old fathers, Ambrose and Augustine, and such others.

[Vol. iv. p.
21.]

M. HARDING.

Why speak ye not plainly? Be there no mo but two sacraments? Though ye say not so expressly, yet we judge that so ye mean. For so your schoolfellow of Geneva, Theodore Beza, The defendants acknowledge but two sacraments.

²¹ [S. August. in Johan. "Illi "Dominum, ille (Judas) panem
" (undecim) manducabant panem "Domini."]

pronounceth in plain terms in the confession of your Genevian faith. And so yourselves, defenders, do affirm in the articles which ye agreed upon in your convocation holden at London in the year of our Lord 1562. Which articles ye have put forth in print by the queen's authority, as ye pretend. Now whereas ye acknowledge there be but two sacraments, why should any man believe you rather than the Germans, your first schoolmasters, who ^a in their confession exhibited to Charles the Fifth, then emperor, at Augsburgh, in the name of all the protestants, anno 1530, appoint three sacraments, baptism, the eucharist, and penance? The next year after ^b Philip Melancthon in his Apology avoucheth those three sacraments: but afterward, in the year 1552, he found out another, and made up the number of four, by adding the sacrament of order to the foresaid three. In Lipsia they receive three: in Wittenberg, which city is not thence far off, they have four. At Magdeburg thereby also Flacius Illyricus, and so many as follow him, will have but two: and the Zwenkfeldians, that spring out of the same stock, care for none at all

Diversity of judgment in the gospels about the number of the sacraments.

a Untruth, fond and vain.

b Untruth, proceeding of unadvised malice. Read the answer.

Forasmuch as ye allege the names of the old fathers for you, specially St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, that there be but two sacraments, let us see how much they make for maintenance of your doctrine, and whether they teach us not that there be more. St. Augustine, in his second book, *Contra literas Petilianus*, speaking of the place of the psalm, *Sicut unguentum in capite*, which the heretic had alleged, saith thus: *In hoc unguento*, &c. "In this ointment his will is to interpret the sacrament of chrism, (he meaneth the sacrament of confirmation,) which in the kind of visible signs is holy, as baptism is." Lo, St. Augustine calleth confirmation a sacrament. St. Eusebius, pope, nameth it a sacrament in his third Epistle written to all the bishops of Tusciana and Campania: *Manus impositionis sacramentum*, &c. "The sacrament of imposition of hands," saith he, "is to be kept with great reverence, which cannot be performed but by the high priests," (he understandeth bishops.) Melchiades, next to Sylvester before the Nicene council, speaking much of confirmation, among other things saith thus: *Duo hæc sacramenta, baptismi, et confirmationis, separanda non sunt*: "These two sacraments of baptism and confirmation may not be sundered." Though these two bishops were popes, yet they deserve credit, forasmuch as they lived before that corruption crept into the church, after your account, and died holy martyrs ²².

That there be no sacraments than two by the doctrine of the fathers, cap. 104.

The sacrament of confirmation.

This forged Melchiades advanceth his oil above the sacrament of baptism.

That penance is a sacrament, and so accounted among the fathers, it is so evident, that who doubteth of it may seem not to have perused their writings. St. Augustine, in *Enchiridio ad Laurentium*, speaking of baptism and penance, calleth both *salu-*

The sacrament of penance. Cap. 66. hom. 20. in Epist. ad Heb.

²² [The Decretal Epistles here bius and Melchiades, are, as is well alleged under the names of Euse- known, forgeries.]

taria sacramenta, "healthful sacraments"²³ St. Ambrose signifieth himself to be of the same mind, in his first book *De Pœnitentia*, cap. 6 and 7; and in the second book, cap. 2, though without putting the express name of sacrament. But in the third chapter of that book he putteth the name of sacrament expressly.

Touching order, that is a sacrament also by verdict of St. Augustine, whom ye allege for you. Let us hear what he saith. In his second book, *contra Epist. Parmeniani*, cap. 13, these be his words, where he speaketh of baptism, and of the power to baptize, which is given in the sacrament of order: *Utrunque enim sacramentum est, et quadam consecratione utrumque homini datur, illud cum baptizatur, istud cum ordinatur. Ideo in catholica non licet utrumque iterari*: "Either of them is a sacrament, and with a certain consecration either is given to man: the one when he is baptized, the other when he taketh orders. Therefore in the catholic church it is not lawful either of them to be taken twice."

For the sacrament of wedlock, besides other good and sufficient proofs, that it is a sacrament, we have sundry testimonies out of St. Augustine, and other doctors. "In the church," saith St. Augustine, "not only the band of marriage, but also the sacrament, is so commended, that it is not lawful for the husband to deliver his wife to another." He calleth wedlock a sacrament in many places of his works, *De Bono Conjugali*, cap. 7, 18, and in the 24th chapter of that book, he saith: *Hæc omnia bona sunt, propter quæ nuptiæ bonæ sunt, proles, fides, sacramentum*: "All these things be good, for which marriage is good, issue, faith, the sacrament."

Of extreme unction, who doubteth whether it be a sacrament, let him read the epistle of Innocentius the First, *ad Decentium Eugubinum Episcopum*, cap. 8, where most plainly treating of it, he nameth it a sacrament. Chrysostom interpreteth the place of St. James' epistle for this sacrament. And so doth Bede, alleging the place of St. James, the sixth of Mark, the authority of Innocentius, and the custom of the church. Seeing then we have found the seven sacraments expressly mentioned in the fathers, according to the teaching of the catholic church: whereas ye teach men to believe there be but two, and pretend that the fathers spake of no mo: ^d I trust from henceforth they will take better advice, how they believe your bare word without all proof, and with certain danger of their souls forsake the doctrine of the church, "which is the sure pillar and ground of truth," as St. Paul saith. In this great point, Beza and ye of that side be manifestly found liars.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

To spend words without cause, is affliction of the spirit

²³ [Harding also alleges St. Chrysostom as naming penance a sacrament.]

The sacrament of order,

The sacrament of wedlock, lib. de Fide et Operibus, cap. 7.

The sacrament of extreme unction.

Jacob 5. lib. 3. de Sacerd.

1 Tim. iii. 15.

^c Untruth. For the ancient fathers never reckon precisely seven only sacraments. ^d As this is true, so we desire further credit.

and loss of time. M. Harding here bestoweth much labour, and allegeth many doctors, to win that thing, that he might easily have obtained without any such ado. For, gentle reader, lest that thou be deceived, and think there is some weight in this heap of feathers, we will grant without force, and freely, that the holy catholic fathers have made mention, not only of *seven*, as M. Harding here accounteth

a Tertull. ad-
versus Ju-
dæos. [cap.
13. p. 199.]

b Tertull.
contra Mar-
cion. lib. 4.
[cap. 2. p.
414.]

c Augustin.
epist. 12.
[ii. 486, 487.]

d Augustin.
in Serm. de
Sanctis 19.
[v. app. 406.]

e Leo de Re-
surrect. Do-
mini, serm. 2.
[l. 307.]

f Hieronym.
ad Oceanum.
[iv. pt. 2.
p. 651.]

g Inter De-
creta Leonis,
[Epist. 90.]
cap. 14.
[Crabb. i.
711.]

h Augustin.
de Peccat.
Merit. et
Remiss. lib.
2. [x. 62.]

i Hilar. in
Matt. canon.
11 et 12, et
canon 23.
[pp. 630, 668.
722. 1052.]

k Bernard. in
Serm. de
Cena Do-
mini. [iii.
898.]

them, but also of *seventeen sundry sacraments*. ^aTertullian calleth the helve, wherewith Elizeus recovered the axe out of the water, *sacramentum ligni*, the “sacrament of wood:” and the whole state of the Christian faith, he calleth ^b*religionis Christianæ sacramentum*: “the sacrament of Christian religion.” ^cSt. Augustine in many places hath *sacramentum crucis*: “the sacrament of the cross.” Thus he saith: *In hac crucis figura continetur sacramentum*: “In this *figure* or form of the cross, there is contained a sacrament²⁴.” So saith Leo: *Crux Christi, quæ salvandis est impensa fidelibus, et sacramentum est, et exemplum*: “*The cross of Christ*, which was given to save the faithful, is both a *sacrament*, and also a *sampler*.” St. Hierom saith: *E latere Christi baptismi, atque martyrii pariter sacramenta funduntur*: “Out of Christ’s side the *sacraments* of *baptism* and *martyrdom* are poured forth both together.” ^eLeo calleth the promise of virginity, *sacramentum*: *Quid eos manebit, qui corruperint fœdera divini sacramenti?* “What shall become of them, that have broken the covenant of the *heavenly sacrament*?” ^hThe bread that was given unto the novices, or beginners in the faith, called *catechumeni*, before they were baptized, of St. Augustine is called a *sacrament*. ⁱSt. Hilary in sundry places saith: *Sacramentum orationis: sacramentum esuritionis: sacramentum scripturarum: sacramentum fletus: sacramentum sitis*: “The sacrament of prayer: the sacrament of fasting: the sacrament of the scriptures: the sacrament of weeping: the sacrament of thirst.” ^kSt. Bernard calleth the washing of the apostles’ feet a sacrament: *Ablutio pedum sacramentum est quotidianorum peccatorum*: “The washing of feet is the sacrament of daily sins²⁵.”

²⁴ [The 19th Serm. de Sanctis is not by St. Augustine.] ²⁵ [Supra, vol. i. 377.]

Thus many, and many mo sacraments, it had been easy for M. Harding to have found in the catholic learned fathers. Yet, I trow, he will not say, that either the *helve of an axe*, or the *whole religion of Christ*, or a *cross printed in the forehead*, or *martyrdom*, or the *scriptures*, or a *vow of virginity*, or the *bread given to the catechumeni*, or *prayer*, or *fasting*, or *weeping*, or *thirst*, or *washing of feet*, are the necessary *seven sacraments* of the church.

Howbeit we will not greatly strive for the name. It appeareth hereby, that many things, that indeed and by special property be no *sacraments*, may nevertheless pass under the general name of a *sacrament*. But thus we say: *It cannot be proved, neither by the scriptures, nor by the ancient learned fathers*, that this number of *sacraments* is so specially appointed, and consecrate to this purpose, or, that there be neither mo nor less *sacraments* in the church, *but only seven*.

As for the reasons, that they of M. Harding's side have brought us for proof hereof, they are too childish to be remembered. For thus they say :

"The book in the Apocalypse hath seven seals :"
Rev. v. 1.

"The seven angels there have seven trumpets :"
Rev. viii. 2.

"Christ hath in his right hand seven stars :"
Rev. i. 16.

"Christ walketh in the midst of seven golden candlesticks²⁶ :"
Rev. i. 13.

"Zachary saw seven eyes upon a stone :"
Zach. iii. 9.

"There were seven candlesticks in the tabernacle :"
Exod. xxxvii. 17.

ergo, say they, there must needs be just *seven sacraments* in the church of God.

In Compend.
Theologie.
[lib. 6. cap.
5.]

But to leave these vanities, and to come to the purpose : unto every *necessary sacrament of the church*, two things specially are required : that is, a *sensible outward element*, and the *word of institution*. Without either of these there is no sacrament. Therefore St. Augustine saith : *Accedat verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum* : "Join the word of Christ's institution unto the sensible creature or outward element, and thereof is *made a sacrament*." The *element* or *creature* in baptism is water : the *elements* or *creatures*

²⁶ [Jewel has substituted this for the similitude of the seven loaves with which the multitude were fed.]

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
So. [iii. pt. 2.
703.]

in our Lord's supper are bread and wine : the words of institution are common and known.

The other five sacraments want either the *word* or the *element*, or both together : as for example, *matrimony*, *order* and *penance*, have the word of God, but they have no outward *creature* or *element* : extreme *unction* and *confirmation* have neither *word* nor *element*. Therefore these five latter, in proper use of speech, are not taken for necessary sacraments of the church.

Alexand.
Hales, pt. 4.
quest. 24.
mem. 1.

For thus Alexander of Hales saith : *Sacramentum confirmationis, ut est sacramentum, neque Dominus instituit, neque apostoli..... : sed postea institutum est in concilio Meldensi* : "The sacrament of *confirmation*, as it is a *sacrament*, was not ordained, either by Christ, or by the apostles : but afterward in the council of Melda."

Durandus.

So likewise Durandus saith : *Matrimonium stricte, et proprie loquendo, non est sacramentum* : " *Matrimony* in due and proper kind of speech, is no sacrament²⁷." Thus one of M. Harding's own doctors saith : " *Confirmation* is no sacrament : " another saith likewise : " *Matrimony* is no sacrament."

Irenæus.
[lib. 5. cap.
ult. p. 335.]
Justin. apol.
2. [al. 1.]
Tertull. 1. et
4. cont. Mar-
cion.
Ambros. de
Sacr.
Cyrill. in
Mystago-
gicis.
Cyprian. lib.
2. epist. 1.
ad Steph.
[p. 128.]

Now to that we make account only of *two sacraments*, as instituted by Christ, wherewith M. Harding findeth himself so much offended, it may please him to understand, that the ancient learned fathers, Irenæus, Justinus Martyr, Tertullian, St. Ambrose, Cyrillus Alexandrinus, and others, having occasion to intreat of purpose and specially hereof, speak only of *two sacraments*, I mean of *baptism* and of *our Lord's supper*, and name none other. St. Cyprian saith : *Tunc demum plane* [al. *plene*] *sanctificari, et esse filii Dei possunt, si utroque sacramento nascantur* : "Then may they be thoroughly sanctified, and become the children of God, if they be new born by *both the sacraments*²⁸." "By *both the sacraments*," he saith, meaning only of two. St. Au-

²⁷ [If the book referred to is the Rationale of Durandus, marriage is there called "sacramentum voluntatis." Lib. i. sect. 6.]

²⁸ [The Editor is doubtful whether Jewel is correct in his interpretation of this place in Cyprian : the context seems rather to shew that St. Cyprian is speaking of bap-

tism and confirmation. His argument is, that persons baptized by heretics or schismatics should be re-baptized, "eo quod parum sit eis manum imponere ad accipiendum Spiritum Sanctum, nisi accipiant et ecclesiæ baptismum. Tunc enim demum plene sanctificari," &c.]

gustine saith: *Quædam pauca pro multis, eademque factu facillima, et intellectu augustissima, et observatione castissima, ipse Dominus et apostolica tradidit disciplina: sicuti est baptismi sacramentum, et celebratio corporis et sanguinis Domini*: “Our Lord and his apostles have delivered unto us a few sacraments instead of many, and the same in doing most easy, in signification most excellent, in observation most reverend: as is the sacrament of baptism, and the celebration of the body and blood of our Lord.” Again, speaking of baptism and of the supper, he saith thus: *Hæc sunt ecclesiæ gemina sacramenta*: “These be the two sacraments of the church²⁹.” “The two sacraments,” he saith, plainly expressing the number of two. Paschasius saith: *Sunt sacramenta Christi in ecclesia catholica, baptismus, et corpus et sanguis Domini*: “These be the sacraments of Christ in the catholic church: baptism and the body and blood of our Lord.” To be short, cardinal Bessarion saith: *Hæc duo sola sacramenta in evangeliiis manifeste tradita legimus*: “We read, that these only two sacraments were delivered us plainly in the gospel.”

Augustin. de Doctrina Christian. lib. 3. cap. 9. [iii. 49.]

Augustin. de Symb. ad Catechumenos. [vi. 562.]

Paschasius de Cena Domini. [c. 25.]

Bessarion de Sacramento. Eucharistie. [p. 181 a.]

Here hath M. Harding in express words, *both the sacraments*, and the *two sacraments*, and the *only two sacraments* of the church. Judge thou now therefore, good Christian reader, what truth thou mayest reckon to be in him, that saith: “Beza, and they of his side, are manifestly found liars.”

Addition.

Addition. ☞ M. Harding. “Bessarion nameth other sacraments. Wherefore there is an impudent lie included in your words, where you say, that I have in express words, the only two sacraments of the church.” *The answer.* What colour have you in your face, M. Harding, when ye thus modestly call others *impudent*? I know not, how Bessarion could in plainer wise have expressed his mind. These be his words: *Hæc duo sola sacramenta in evangeliiis manifeste tradita legimus*: “We read, that these only two sacraments are delivered to us plainly in the gospels.” If *only two* be *only two*, then judge thou, good reader, *who is impudent.* ☞

M. Harding, fol. 335 a.

²⁹ [This 2d Serm. de Symbolo not genuine, written by an author is considered by the Bened. Edd. far inferior to St. Augustine.]

Concil. Tri-
dent. sess. 7.
[Hard. x. §2.]

All these things notwithstanding, the late pretended council of Trident, with most horrible threats and great curses, concludeth the contrary: *Si quis dixerit, sacramenta novæ legis non fuisse omnia a Jesu Christo Domino nostro instituta, aut esse plurâ, vel pauciora, quam septem,.....aut etiam aliquod horum non esse vere et proprie sacramentum, anathema sit*: “If any man shall say, that the sacraments of the new law were not all ordained of our Lord Jesus Christ, or that there be *fewer or mo than seven*, or, that any one of the same, verily, and in proper use of speech, is not a sacrament, accursed be he.”

In Captivi-
tate Baby-
lonica.
[sub fin.]

But, ye say, Luther and the Germans admit *three sacraments, baptism, the Lord’s supper, and penance*: and Philip Melancthon afterward found out the *fourth*. O, M. Harding, what is it, that thus enflameth your tongue to speak untruth? If it had pleased you to have seen it, Luther and Melancthon plainly expressed their own meaning, and utterly removed all manner occasion of such cavils. Luther writeth thus: *Proprie ea visum est vocare sacramenta, quæ annexis signis promissa sunt: cætera quia signis alligata non sunt, nuda promissa sunt. Quo fit, ut si rigide loqui velimus, tantum duo sint in ecclesia Dei sacramenta, baptismus et panis: cum in his solis, et institutum divinitus signum, et promissionem remissionis peccatorum videamus*: “In *proper speech* those we call *sacraments*, which are promised with signs annexed. The rest, that have no signs, are *bare promises*. Wherefore, speaking hereof precisely and strictly, there are *only two sacraments* in the church of God, *baptism and the bread*: forasmuch as in *these only* we find both the *sign* ordained by God, and also the *promise of remission of sins*.”

In Apologia
Confessionis
Augustanæ.

Likewise Melancthon saith: “He can well call *order* a *sacrament*, so that it be known from *baptism* and the *supper*, which in proper speech and verily be called *sacraments*.”

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 11. Divis. 3.

We say, that *baptism* is a sacrament of the re-^[Vol. iv. p. 21.] mission of sins, and of that washing, which we have in the *blood of Christ*: and that no person, which

will profess Christ's name, ought to be restrained or kept back therefrom: no not the very babes of Christians: forasmuch as they be born in sin, and do pertain unto the people of God.

M. HARDING.

Baptism very slenderly spoken of by the defenders.

Baptism taught by our new clergy to be but a sign and seal of our new birth.

That in baptism sins be fully and truly forgiven.

Ezek. xxxvi. 25.

Tit. iii. 5

[S. Augustine. x. 448.]

Pelagians belied the catholics, as the sacramentaries do also now.

As ye acknowledge few sacraments, so ye speak of them very slenderly. "Baptism," ye say, "is a sacrament of the remission of sins, and of that washing which we have in the blood of Christ." Now whereas ye mean, as within few lines ye declare, by the name of a sacrament, ^ano more but a token or sign, specially sith ye teach in your Articles, that baptism at the best is but a sign and seal of our new birth: ye seem not to attribute to baptism so much as the scripture doth. Neither is baptism only a sign or token that sins be remitted, but we believe, as the catholic church, according to the scriptures, teacheth, that in and by baptism sins be fully and truly remitted and put away: and that, not through the faith ^bonly of the giver or receiver, or of any other, though hereunto it be necessary in those that be come to age of discretion: but through the power and virtue of the sacrament, and God's promise. And therefore to whom it is given, of them it is rightly said, that they be baptized for remission of their sins. The scriptures be plain. First, Ezekiel, speaking of this holy sacrament, saith in the person of God: "I will shed upon you clean water, and ye shall be made clean from all your defilings, and from your idols will I cleanse you." Next St. Paul saith: "That God hath saved us by the washing of regeneration, and of the renewing of the Holy Ghost, whom he hath poured upon us abundantly by Jesus Christ our Saviour." That I may add to these manifest scriptures the authority of a learned father, not whereby to strengthen the truth of them, but to witness our right understanding of them: St. Augustine, lib. 3, *contra duas epist. Pelagian.* cap. 3, shewing the slander of the Pelagians against the catholics, saith thus in their person: "Again, they" (that is, after their meaning, the catholics) "avouch, that baptism maketh not indeed new men again, that is to wit, that it giveth not full remission of sins," &c. Thereto eftsoons answering, St. Augustine saith: ^c*Mentiuntur: insidiantur: tergiversantur*: "They lie: they study how to deceive: they seek shifts:" we say not this. And after certain sentences returning to baptism, he concludeth thus: "Wherefore baptism washeth away all sins, utterly all, of deeds, words, thoughts, be they original, or actual: be they done ignorantly, or wittingly. But it taketh not away the infirmity, which the regenerate resisteth," &c. Which place doth not only set forth the virtue of baptism, but also ^ddestroyeth the doctrine of our new gospellers, that affirm concupiscence, which remaineth after baptism, to be verily sin. ^eWherein they err manifestly against the scripture, and sense of the fathers.

^a Untruth. For we say not so.

^b This tale is needless, and out of season.

^c These words may well pertain to M. Harding himself. For we say not thus.

^d Untruth joined with gross ignorance. M. Harding foully mistaketh St. Augustine's mind.

^e Untruth, fond and vain. Read the answer.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Ill will is ever plentiful of ill words. M. Harding here maketh himself much matter without cause. He teacheth our *new clergy*, "That baptism is not only a sign or a token of remission of sins:" he telleth us of "the faith of the giver: of the faith of the receiver: of the power of the sacrament: of concupiscence, that it is no sin." And more, I trow, he would have said, if more had presently come to mind. Verily the poor *new clergy* speaketh not one word in all this whole place, neither of *sign*, nor of *token*, nor of the *receiver*, nor of the *giver*, nor of the *power* of the sacrament, nor of *concupiscence*, whether it be *sin*, or not *sin*, nor of any other like thing. Yet in the end he taketh St. Augustine's *words, without his meaning*, and crieth out against us: "They lie: they study to deceive: they seek shifts." And why so? Certainly because we say: "Baptism is a sacrament of remission of sins:" and, "That the children of the faithful, for that they be born in sin, and pertain to the people of God, ought therefore to be baptized." Other causes than these in any our words he can find none.

True it is, that *sacrament* dependeth not, neither of the *minister*, nor of the *receiver*, nor of any other. For though they be all the children of sin, yet is *baptism* the sacrament of remission of sin. St. Augustine saith: *Securum me fecit magister meus, de quo Spiritus ejus dicit, Hic est qui baptizat*: "Christ my master hath assured me, of whom his own Spirit saith, 'This is he, that baptizeth.'"

Nevertheless, concerning the *faith of the parents* and others, the holy doctors have sometime written otherwise. St. Augustine saith: *Satis pie recteque creditur, prodesse parvulo eorum fidem a quibus consecrandus offertur*: "It is good and godly to believe, that the child is *holpen by the faith of them* by whom he is offered, or brought unto baptism." Again he saith: *Accommodat illis mater ecclesia aliorum pedes, ut veniant: aliorum cor, ut credant*: "Our mother the church lendeth them *other men's feet*, that they may come: and *other men's hearts*, that they may believe." The like sayings might be alleged out of Justinus Martyr, St. Cyprian, St. Hierom, and others. For thus they write.

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
5. [iii. pt. 2.
327.]

De Con. dist.
4. Baptismus
talis.
Johan. i. 33.

Augustin. de
Libero Arbitrio,
lib. 3. cap. 23. [i.
637.]

Augustin. de
Verbis Apostoli,
serm. 10. [v. 840.]

How truly I will not say. But their words be plain. The prophet Habakkuk saith: *Justus ex fide sua vivet*: "The just man shall live" (not by the faith of his parents, but) "by his own faith."

Of this faith St. Hierom saith: *Qui plena fide non suscipiunt salutare baptisma, accipiunt quidem aquam, sed non accipiunt Spiritum*: "They that receive not baptism with perfect faith, receive the water: but the Holy Ghost they receive not²³." St. Augustine saith: *Verus baptismus constat, non tam ablutione corporis, quam fide cordis, sicut apostolica doctrina tradidit, dicens, Fide mundans corda eorum: et alibi, Salvos facit baptisma, non carnis depositio sordium, sed conscientie bonæ interrogatio in Deum, per resurrectionem Jesu Christi*: "True baptism standeth not so much in washing of the body, as in the faith of the heart: as the doctrine of the apostles hath taught us, saying, 'By faith purifying their hearts:' and in another place, 'Baptism maketh us safe: not that putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the examining of a good conscience before God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.'" Likewise again he saith: *Unde ista tanta virtus aquæ, ut corpus tangat, et cor abluat, nisi faciente verbo? Non quia dicitur, sed quia creditur*: "Whence is all this so great virtue, or power of the water, that it toucheth the body, and washeth the heart, but by the working of the word? Not for that it is spoken" (by the minister), "but for that it is believed" (of the faithful).

Some man will say: "Children or infants believe nothing, but are utterly void of faith." St. Augustine answereth: *Qui non crediderit, condemnabitur. Sicut eos renasci per ministerium baptizantium, ita etiam (eos) credere per corda et ora confitentium confitemur*: "He that believeth not shall be damned. We confess, that as they be born again by the ministry of baptizers, so they believe by the hearts and mouths of the confessors." Again he saith:

²³ [S. Hieron. "Quod quidem non solum de hæreticis sed de ecclesiasticis intelligi potest, quia non plena fide accipiunt baptis-

mum salutare, de quibus dicitur: 'dum est, quod accipiunt aquam, sed non accipiunt Spiritum.'"]

Hieronym. in Ezekiel. xvi. [iii. 784.]

De Con. dist. 4. Verus.

Acts xv. 9.

1 Pet. iii. 21.

Augustin. in Johann. tract. 80. [iii. pt. 2. 703.]

Augustin. in Epist. 105. [ii. 729.]

Augustin.
epist. 23. In
ead. epist.
[ii. 267.]

Habent fidem propter fidei sacramentum : “ They have faith, because they have” (baptism, which is) “ the sacrament of faith.” For he saith : *Quemadmodum sacramentum corporis Christi, secundum quendam modum corpus Christi est,.....ita sacramentum fidei fides est* : “ As the sacrament of Christ’s body” (not verily and indeed, but) “ after a certain manner of speech, is Christ’s body : so baptism is faith, because it is the sacrament of faith.” Therefore cardinal Cajetan is worthily blamed by Catharinus, in that he saith : “ An infant, for that he wanteth instruction in faith, therefore hath not perfect baptism.”

Catharinus
contra Caje-
tanum, error.
87 et 88. [p.
158.]

Touching the virtue or power of this sacrament, if M. Harding mean thereby the outward element of the water, he knoweth, or may easily know, it is a common resolution amongst all his own school doctors : *Gratia Dei non est alligata sacramentis* : “ The grace of God is not tied to any sacraments.” The meaning thereof is this : That God is able to work salvation both with them and without them.

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
80. [iii. pt. 2.
703.]
De Con. dist.
4. Aliud est.

St. Augustine saith, as it is before alleged : *Jam vos mundi estis propter sermonem quem loquutus sum vobis. Quare non ait, Mundi estis propter baptismum quo loti estis : nisi quia etiam in aqua verbum mundat ? Detrahe verbum, et quid est aqua, nisi aqua ?* “ Now are ye clean, because of the word that I have spoken to you. But why saith he not, Now ye are clean, because of the baptism wherewith ye are washed : saving that, because in the water it is the word that maketh clean ? Take away the word, and what is the water, more than water ?” Therefore he saith : *Aqua exhibet forinsecus sacramentum gratiæ* : “ The water giveth us outwardly the sacrament of grace.” And this is the power and virtue of the sacraments.

Augustin.
epist. 23. [ii.
264.]

Notwithstanding, we must consider, that the learned fathers in their treatises of the sacraments, sometime use the outward sign, instead of the thing itself that is signified : sometime they use the thing signified, instead of the sign. As for example, sometimes they name *Christ’s blood* instead of the *water* : sometime they name the *water* instead of *Christ’s blood*. This figure is called *metonymia*, that is to say, an exchange of names : and is much used among the learned, specially speaking of the sacraments.

St. Augustine, using the *water* in place of the *blood of Christ* that is signified by the *water*, saith thus: *Solvit vinculum culpæ: reconciliat bonum naturæ: regenerat hominem in uno Christo*: “It breaketh the band of sin: it reconcileth the goodness of nature: it doth renew a man in one Christ²⁴.”

Notwithstanding, indeed, and in precise manner of speech, *salvation* must be sought in Christ alone, and not in any outward signs. “Christ is that Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world.” The “blood of Christ maketh us clean from all our sins.” St. Cyprian saith: *Remissio peccatorum, sive per baptismum, sive per alia sacramenta donetur, proprie Spiritus Sancti est: et ipsi soli hujus efficientiæ privilegium manet. Verborum solemnitas, et sacri invocatio nominis, et signa apostolicis institutionibusattributa, visibile celebrant sacramentum. Rem vero ipsam Spiritus Sanctus format et efficit*: “The remission of sin, whether it be given by baptism, or by any other sacrament, is indeed of the Holy Ghost: and to the same Holy Ghost only the privilege of this work doth appertain. The solemnity of the words, and the invocation of God’s holy name, and the outward signs appointed to the ministry of the priests by the institution of the apostles, work the visible outward sacrament: but touching the substance thereof,” (which is the remission of sins,) “it is the Holy Ghost that worketh it²⁵.”

Likewise saith St. Hierom: *Homo aquam tantum tribuit: Deus autem dat Spiritum Sanctum, quo sordes ab-*

²⁴ [S. August. epist. 23. “Aqua igitur exhibens forinsecus sacramentum gratiæ, et Spiritus operans intrinsecus beneficium gratiæ, solvens vinculum culpæ, reconcilians bonum naturæ, regenerant hominem in uno Christi.” Bp. Jewel’s interpretation of this passage appears to the Editor very questionable. First, the assertion that St. Augustine is “using the water in place of the blood of Christ” seems quite gratuitous—and secondly, the words “solvens vinculum culpæ,” &c. would na-

turally be referred to “Spiritus,” rather than to “aqua.” It will be observed also, that the effect is attributed by the singular verb “regenerat,” to the water alone (metonymically used for the blood), which is described by the plural “regenerant” as the joint effect of water and the Spirit, the one as the means external, the other as furnishing the inward and spiritual grace.]

²⁵ [Cyprian de Baptismo. See supra vol. i. p. 207, note ⁴⁶.]

Augustin.
epist. 23 [ii.
264.]

Cyprian.
[Arnold.] de
Baptismo
Christi. [app.
xciii.]

Hieronym. in
Esaiam, cap.
iv. [iii. 44.]

Hieronym.
ad Galat.
cap. iii. [iv.
264.]

luuntur : “The minister, being a man, giveth *only the water* : but God giveth the Holy Ghost, whereby the sins be washed away.” And again : *Si quis corporeum, et quod oculis carnis aspicitur, aquæ tantum accipit lavacrum, non est indutus Dominum Jesum Christum* : “If any man have received *only the bodily washing of water*, that is outwardly seen with the eye, he hath not put on our Lord Jesus Christ.”

Rom. vii. 23.

Concerning *concupiscence* remaining in the faithful after baptism, whether it be *sin* or no *sin*, there was no great cause, why M. Harding should in this place move question : saving that, as he hath hitherto denied that *falsehood* is *falsehood*, so he would now deny that *sin* is *sin*. Undoubtedly St. Paul, feeling the same *concupiscence* in himself, is forced to mourn, and to cry out : “I see another law in my members, fighting against the law of my mind, and leading me prisoner to the *law of sin*.” And again : “O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from *this body of death* ?”

Ambros. lib.
10. epist. 84.
[Demetriadi :
ed. Basil.
1527, tom. iii.
277.]

Therefore St. Ambrose saith : *Non invenitur in ullo hominum tanta concordia, ut legi mentis lex quæ membris est insita, non repugnet. Propter quod ex omnium sanctorum persona accipitur, quod Johannes apostolus ait, Si dixerimus quod peccatum non habemus, nos ipsos seducimus, et veritas in nobis non est* : “There is not found in any man such concord” (between the flesh and the spirit), “but that the law” (of *concupiscence*), “which is planted in the members, fighteth against the law of the mind. And for that cause these words of St. John the apostle are taken as spoken in the person of *all saints*, ‘If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and there is no truth in us²⁵.’” And, to leave all others, St. Augustine saith in most plain wise : *Concupiscentia carnis, adversus quam bonus concupiscit spiritus, et peccatum est,.....et pœna peccati,.....et causa peccati* : “The *concupiscence* of the *flesh*, against which the good spirit lusteth, is *both sin, and the pain of*

1 John i. 10.

Augustin.
contra Jul.
lib. v. cap. 3.
[x. 631.]

²⁵ [S. Ambros. epist. 84. This ground that it was more probably Epistle has been omitted in the written by Prosper Aquitanus.] Bened. ed., apparently on the

sin, and the cause of sin." And again he saith : *Quamdiu* Augustin. in Johan. tract. 41. [lii. pt. ii. 376.]
(vivis,) necesse est peccatum esse in membris tuis.....
 "As long as thou livest, there must needs be sin in thy members²⁶."

If M. Harding say : "We wrest and rack St. Augustine, and take his words otherwise than he meant," Albertus Pighius, his own principal doctor, will control him. Thus he writeth : *Augustinus tradit,.....hanc ipsam concupiscentiam corpori nostro inspersam atque innatam,.....in nondum renatis [leg. baptizatis] vere et proprie peccatum esse : quæ ignoscatur quidem, sed non tollatur in baptismo :* Albertus Pighius in Controver. de Peccato Originis.
 "St. Augustine teacheth us, that this same concupiscence, planted in our body in them that be not regenerate by baptism, *verily and in plain manner of speech is sin : and that the same concupiscence is forgiven in baptism, but is not utterly taken away.*"

Yet the late blessed chapter of Trident, in spite of St. Augustine, hath published the contrary. For this is the determination of the fathers there : *Hanc concupiscentiam quam apostolus aliquando appellat peccatum, sancta synodus declarat ecclesiam catholicam nunquam intellexisse, [suppl. peccatum appellari], quod vere et proprie in renatis peccatum sit : sed quia ex peccato est, et ad peccatum inclinat. Si quis autem contrarium senserit, anathema sit :* Concil. Trident. sess. 5. [Hard. x. 29.]
 "The concupiscence, which the apostle St. Paul sometime calleth sin, this holy council declareth that the catholic church never understood it to be called *sin*, for that it is so indeed, and in proper manner of speech, in them that be baptized : but because it is of sin, and inclineth us unto sin. And if any man think the contrary, accursed be he." Thus we see, that by the decree of this worthy covent, St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine, and other holy fathers that have written the same, are all accursed.

As for that M. Harding here toucheth as an error defended by certain, I know not by whom, *that baptism giveth not full remission of sins*, he may command it home again to Louvain amongst his fellows, and join it with other of

²⁶ [S. August. "Quamdiu peccatum necesse est esse in membris tuis, saltem illi regnum
 "auferatur," &c. The word "vivis" is not found in the passage, at least according to ed. Ben.]

his and their vanities. For it is no part nor portion of our doctrine. We confess, and have evermore taught, that in the *sacrament of baptism*, by the death and blood of Christ, is given remission of all manner sins : and that not in half, or in part, or by way of imagination, or by fancy : but full, whole, and perfect of all together : so that now, as St. Paul saith, “ There is no damnation unto them that be in Christ Jesus.”

Rom. viii. 1.

Now judge thou indifferently, gentle reader, what spirit forced M. Harding thus terribly to cry out: “ They lie : they study to deceive : they seek shifts,” &c.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 12. *Divis. 1.*

We say, that *eucharistia*, that is to say, the *supper of the Lord*, is a sacrament, that is, an evident representation of the body and blood of Christ, wherein is set, as it were, before our eyes, the death of Christ, and his resurrection, and whatsoever he did whilst he was in his mortal body : to the end we may give him thanks for his death, and for our deliverance. And that, by the often receiving of this sacrament²⁷, we may daily renew the remembrance thereof, to the intent we, being fed with the body and blood of Christ, may be brought into the hope of the resurrection, and of everlasting life, and may most assuredly believe, that, as our bodies be fed with bread and wine, so our souls be fed with the body and blood of Christ²⁸.

²⁷ [Ed. Lat. “sacramentorum.”]

²⁸ [The difference between the original and the translation, according to the punctuation adopted in the text, is so material, that it seems expedient to print the passage in Latin : “Eucharistiam esse sacramentum, hoc est, symbolum conspicuum corporis et sanguinis Christi, in quo subjicitur quodammodo oculis nostris mors Christi, et ejus resurrectio, et quæcunque gessit in humano

“corpore : ut de ejus morte et nostra liberatione gratias agamus, et frequentatione sacramentorum, ejus rei memoriam assidue renovemus ; ut vero Christi corpore et sanguine alimur, in spem resurrectionis et vitæ æternæ, utque pro certissimo habeamus, id esse animis nostris alendis corpus et sanguinem Christi, quod alendis corporibus est panis et vinum.” Supra vol. iv. p. 22. It will be seen, that, according

[Vol. iv. p. 22.]

M. HARDING.

Among all these gay words ^a we hear not so much as one ^a We utter syllable uttered, whereby we may understand that ye believe the as many syllables of real very body of Christ to be indeed present in the blessed sacrament presence as Christ ever of the altar. Ye confess the *eucharistia*, which commonly ye uttered.

The Lord's supper with the defenders is an evident token of the body and blood of Christ.

to be none other than an evident token of the body and blood of Christ. As for that ye add, to make the matter seem somewhat, of the death of Christ, and his resurrection, and his acts done in flesh : what reason or scripture have ye, that a piece of bread and a cup of wine (for ^b in your belief more make ye not of this ^b Untruth, joined with slander. sacrament) can set them, as it were, before our eyes ? doth not rather a fair painted table set forth the acts of our Saviour before our eyes more lively, and more expressly ? and be we not moved therewith to give God thanks for his great benefits, as well as if we have bread and wine on a table ? But I pray you, sithence all is ^c but bread and wine after your teaching, how shall we, by ^c Untruth, slanderous, as the former. eating and drinking thereof, be fed with the body and blood of Christ ? Again, can we by ^d bread and wine be brought into hope ^d Even as well as by the water in baptism. of the resurrection, and everlasting life, as ye say ? and how shall we by eating of bread, and drinking of wine, be assured that Christ's body and blood doth in like manner feed our souls, as bread and wine feedeth our bodies ? Though your imagination be never so strong, yet by eating of that which is bread only, and drinking of that which is wine only, we see not how your souls can be fed with the true body and blood of Christ, no more than ye be at your common meals.

Faith doth all. The catholic doctrine touching the sacrament of the altar.

Verily, when all your tale is told, ye seem to say nothing else touching the eating of our Lord's body, but that the body of Christ remaineth in heaven, and that we must send up our souls thither, to eat it there by a certain imagination, which ye call faith. For this is your master Calvin's doctrine.....By this doctrine all standeth upon your faith : your faith doth all alone. And he that believeth in Christ, so as ye teach, eateth his body, and drinketh his blood. For by your gospel, to eat the body is nothing else, but to believe in Christ. If this be true, then is your supper superfluous.....

For declaration of the truth herein, it is to be considered, that when we speak of this blessed sacrament, we mean specially the thing received to be the very real body of Christ, not only a sign or token of his body : yet we think it necessary, ^e the doctrine of the fathers be clearly taught : which is, that here is a sacrament, and the thing of the sacrament. The ^f form of bread and wine, which is seen, is the sacrament, that is to say, a sign of the holy ^e Untruth, contrary to the ancient fathers : read the answer. ^f Untruth without sense or savour. No catholic father ever taught this peevish doctrine.

to the translation, the words "to the intent," &c. are referred to "we may daily renew the remembrance thereof;" whereas each of

the sentences beginning with "ut" is to be referred to "subjicitur quodammodo," &c.]

thing. For a sacrament, besides the outward shape which it representeth to the senses, causeth another thing to come into knowledge. The thing of this sacrament is of two sorts: the one ^g in the same contained and signified, the other signified, but not contained. The first is the body of Christ born of the Virgin Mary, and his blood shed for our redemption; the second is the unity of the church in those that be predestinate, called, justified, and glorified. Which church is Christ's body mystical. So that here are three distinct things understood: The one is a sacrament only: the other a sacrament and the thing: the third the thing and not a sacrament. The first is the visible shape or form of bread and wine: the second is the proper and very flesh and blood of Christ: the third his mystical body.

A threefold distinction to be considered in the doctrine of this sacrament. Indistinct speaking of distinct things,

And as there be two things of this sacrament, so be there also two means or ways of eating: the one sacramental, after which both good and ^h evil eat the true body of Christ: they to salvation, these to damnation: the other spiritual, after which the good only do eat. These defenders, as all other the sacramentaries, speaking of these distinct things indistinctly, cause confusion, and deceive the unlearned readers.....In such a sense and meaning the place commonly alleged out of St. Augustine, as also many other the like, may well be understood, without prejudice of the truth of Christ's body in the sacrament: *Ut quid paras dentem et ventrem? Crede, et manducasti*: "To what purpose makest thou ready teeth and belly? Believe, and thou hast eaten." Now these defenders harping only upon this one string of spiritual eating, and shunning the faith of the catholic church touching the true presence of the body, and violently wresting the holy scripture and ancient fathers to a contrary sense, admitting figures for truth, tropes for the letter, shadows for things, play us many a false lesson, and teach horrible lies, to the utter subversion of those that be led by them.

g Untruth, and one of M. Harding's mystical dreams.

h Untruth, ho rible and heathenish.

All this is only M. Harding's descant. We admit figures for figures, and truth for truth.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

"Here is no mention," saith M. Harding, "of real presence:" and thereupon he playeth us many a proper lesson. Notwithstanding, here is as much mention made of real presence, as either Christ or his apostles ever made: or in the primitive catholic church of God was ever believed.

M. Harding, fol. 339 b.

Addition. ☞ M. Harding. "St. Ambrose saith:..... *Addition.*

'Thou which receivest the flesh of Christ art made partaker in that food of his divine substance.....But if it were bread which we receive at Christ's supper, in that food of bread we should not be made partakers of the divine substance,' &c. Chrysostom saith:.....: *Vasa non sunt capacia* [Ambros. de Sacram. lib. 6. cap. 1.] [Chrysost. in Eph. hom. 3.]

M. Harding, fol. 340 b.

illius quem in se habent : non sentiunt illum : nos vero plane :

‘The vessels be not partakers of him, nor feel him whom they contain : but we do truly,’ &c. Leo saith : ‘Ye ought so to communicate of the holy table, that ye doubt nothing at all of Christ’s body and blood : *Hoc enim ore sumitur, quod fide creditur* : ‘For that thing is taken in my mouth, which is believed in faith,’ &c. These are such testimonies that can never be avoided by any answer.” *The answer.*

Whether these testimonies may be answered or no, I doubt not but it may soon appear. But first, M. Harding, it may please you to remember, that the author that beareth the name of Chrysostom saith thus : *In sacris vasis non est*

verum corpus Christi, sed mysterium corporis ejus continetur : Chrysost. in Opere Im. perfecto, hom. 11. [vi. app. 63.]

“The very body of Christ is not in the holy vessels, but the sacrament of that body is therein contained.” Here have we Chrysostom against Chrysostom²⁹ : the one saith :

“Christ’s body is in the vessels :” the other saith : “Christ’s body is not in the vessels.” And as touching the mouth,

St. Augustine saith : “The body of Christ requireth the hunger of the inward man : by inward drinking I am blessed : this bread entereth not into the belly : to believe

in Christ, that is to eat the bread of life.” Thus we see, that *Christ’s body is in the vessels*, and yet *not in the vessels* : *in the mouth*, and yet *not in the mouth*. These contradic-

tions may easily be reconciled, if a man be acquainted with the phrases of the ancient writers. For further resolution whereof, and for shortness of time, I will refer thee, gentle

reader, to that I have elsewhere written touching the same. There shalt thou find, that as Chrysostom saith

here, “Christ’s body is in the vessels,” even so Athanasius saith, “Our Lord is in the words of the scriptures :” St.

Augustine saith : “Holy men receive Christ in their hands, and in their foreheads :” St. Chrysostom saith : “The priest beareth the Holy Ghost :” St. Augustine saith : “The

people is laid upon the communion table : the people is in the cup :” St. Gregory saith : “Abel by signification bare

[Leo serm. 6, de jejun. 7. mens.]

Chrysost. in Opere Im. perfecto, hom. 11. [vi. app. 63.]

[Augustin. Opp. iii. pt. 2. p. 493.]

Defence, pt. 2, chap. 14. divis. 45.

[Athanas. Opp. i. 1002.]

[† August. lii. app. 172.]

[Chrysost. i. 383.]

[De Cons. dist. 2. Quia passus.]

²⁹ [The passage, however, referred to by Harding is genuine ; whereas the *Opus Imperfectum* Jewel himself seems to consider very doubtful.]

[Gregor. in
Johan. lib.
29. c. 28.]

Christ in his hands." These and other like phrases are there alleged. Thus is Christ's *body* present, not really, nor in substance, but only in mystery. Thus Chrysostom saith: "Christ's body is in the communion vessels:" thus Leo saith: "The same body is in the mouth of the faithful." Now if M. Harding will gather of Chrysostom, that Christ's "body is really present in the vessels," or of Leo, "that the same body is really present in the mouth:" then must he likewise gather of these other fathers, that *God is really present in the words of the scripture*: that *Christ is really present in our foreheads*: that *the Holy Ghost is really present in the bason*: that *the people is really laid upon the holy table*, or *really present in the cup*: and that, *Abel bare Christ really in his hands*. Such and other like absurdities, M. Harding, must needs follow of your doctrine.

Gregor. Nys-
senus, de
Anima, cap.
11. [il. p.
111.]

But Gregorius Nyssenens saith: *Abusive aliquid in aliquo loco esse dicimus, propter operationem ejus quæ ibi est. Cum enim dicere deberemus, Ibi operatur, dicimus, Ibi est*: "We say, that a thing is in some place, by an abuse of speech, in respect of the effect of something that there is wrought. For whereas we should say, 'There it worketh,' we say, 'There it is.'" Thus we say: *The moon is in the head*, or *in the leg*: and our words are true: and yet indeed substantially and really, the *moon* is neither in the one part nor in the other. And this is it, that Chrysostom saith: "The very body of Christ is not in the communion vessels: but the sacrament thereof is there contained."

But St. Ambrose saith: "In receiving the sacrament, we are made partakers of the divine substance." "This," say you, "could not be, if there remained bread in the sacrament." And why so, M. Harding? Are not we partakers of the same *divine substance* in the *sacrament of baptism*? St. Augustine saith: "By baptism we are incorporate into Christ, and are made one body with his body²⁹." Leo saith: *Corpus regenerati, fit caro crucifixi*: "The body of him that is new born in baptism is made the flesh of Christ crucified;" that is to say, flesh of his flesh, and bone

Augustin. de
Baptismo
parvulor. [de
peccat. merit.
et remiss.]
Leo de pas-
sione Dom.
serm. 14. [l.
284.]

²⁹ [Supra vol. i. p. 225, note 61.]

of his bone. And what greater participation of the *divine substance* can you desire? Yet nevertheless the very *substance of water* remaineth still. Even so, notwithstanding we be made partakers of the *divine substance* of Christ in the receiving of the holy mysteries, yet the *substance of bread* therein remaineth still. And, forasmuch as ye would prove by these words of St. Ambrose, that *Christ is present in the sacrament*; the same St. Ambrose also saith, that “Christ is likewise present in the water of baptism.” Thus Ambros. de his qui initi- ant. cap. 2. [leg. cap. 3. ii. 327.] he saith: *Crede divinitatis illic esse [l. adesse] præsentiam. Operationem credis? Non credis præsentiam? Unde sequetur operatio, nisi præcederet ante præsentia? &c. Crede adesse Dominum Jesum invocatum precibus sacerdotum. Ait, Ubi fuerint duo, vel tres, ibi et ego sum. Quanto magis ubi est ecclesia, ubi mysteria sua sunt, ibi dignatur suam impartire præsentiam?* “Believe thou, that there” (in the *sacraments of baptism*) “is the presence of the Godhead. Believest thou the working? and believest thou not the presence? How could the working follow, unless the presence went before? Believe thou, that our Lord Jesus is present,” (at the baptism,) “being called upon by the prayers of the priests. Christ saith, ‘Whereas be two or three, there am I.’ How much more will he vouchsafe to offer his presence, whereas his church is, and whereas are the mysteries” (of his baptism³⁰)! Now, M. Harding, as Christ is *present* in the one sacrament, even so, and none otherwise³¹, is he *present* in the other.

But Leo saith: “The same thing is received by the mouth that is believed by our faith.” These words, as Leo meant them, are very true: but, as you would handle them by your constructions, they are most untrue. Leo, in that place, disputeth against the heretic Eutyches, whose error was this: “That Christ’s body after his ascension was wholly changed into his Godhead, and that therefore now he hath no body at all.” Against him Leo reasoneth thus: “The very sacrament of Christ’s body, which thou

³⁰ [Ambros de Myster. It will be remembered, that the genuineness of this work is doubtful.]

³¹ [The Editor cannot suppress

his opinion, that this is, to say the least, a very unguarded expression.]

receivest with thy mouth, is sufficient to reprove thee. For if Christ, being now in heaven, have no body at all, how can this be a sacrament of his body?" In like sort Chrysostom disputeth against certain other heretics, that said, "Christ died not upon the cross." *Nam quando dicunt,* &c. "When they say, How may it appear that Christ was crucified: besides many other arguments, we bring forth the mysteries, and stop their mouths. For if Christ died not, whose figure, whose sign or remembrance is this sacrifice?" *Cujus symbolum (ac signum) est hoc sacrificium*³¹? As if he would reason thus: "The sacrament is a remembrance of Christ's death; therefore it is evident, that Christ hath died."

Chrysost. in
Matt. hom.
83. [vii. 783.]

Tertull. con-
tra Marcion.
lib. 4. [cap.
40. p. 456.]

Likewise Tertullian reasoneth against the heretic Marcion, that said, "Christ had never any body at all, but only a vain show, or a likeness of a body:" "Christ," saith he, "said thus: 'This is my body,' that is to say, This is a figure of my body. It could not be a figure, unless Christ indeed had a body. For a vain show, or a likeness, can bear no figure." Thus reasoneth Tertullian: (*Christus, acceptum panem, et distributum discipulis, corpus suum illum fecit, Hoc est corpus meum, dicendo, id est, Figura corporis mei: figura autem non fuisset, nisi veritatis esset corpus. Cæterum vacua [supp. res] quod est phantasma figuram capere non posset*³².)

Even so saith Leo unto Eutyches: "Thou sayest that Christ hath no body; but the very sacrament that thou receivest reproveth thee. For the thing that thy mouth receiveth is the same that thou believest by thy faith:" that is to say, "It is a sacrament of that thing that thou believest by thy faith." We believe that Christ was *born* in the very substance of our body; that he *died*; that he was *buried*; that he *rose again*; that he ascended into heaven in the same body; and that he *sitteth at the right hand of God the Father*. The sacrament of that body is it, that we receive with our mouths. So saith Gelasius: *Hoc*

Gelasius con-
tra Eutychen.
[Bibl. Patr.
v. pt. 3. p.
671.]

³¹ [See the original, printed
supr. vol. ii. p. 356. note ⁵⁰.]

³² [It is remarkable, that the
passage between brackets was in-

troduced subsequently to the ed.
of 1570, which had received bp.
Jewel's latest corrections.]

nobis in ipso Domino sentiendum est, quod in ejus imagine profitemur: “We must think the same of Christ our Lord that we profess in” (the sacrament, which is) “his image. “We must think the same,” he saith: and yet, if we go precisely to the matter, we may in no wise “think the same.” So saith St. Augustine: *Aqua corpus tangit, et cor abluit*: “The water” (of baptism) “toucheth the body, and washeth the heart.” Yet is it not the *water* indeed, that washeth the heart. The *water* is a *sacrament of God’s grace*: and that is it, *that washeth the heart*. So saith Leo in another place, speaking likewise of the sacrament: *Transimus in quod sumimus*: “We are changed into the same thing, that we receive.” Yet, I trow, M. Harding, you will not say *we are changed into the sacrament*, but we are changed into Christ’s *body*, that is represented by the *sacrament*.

Aug. in Jo-
han. tract. 80.
[iii. pt. 2. p.
793.]

This answer is plain, and agreable to the articles of our faith, and to the general doctrine of the catholic fathers. And these are the *testimonies*, which M. Harding saith “can never be avoided by any answer while the world standeth.” ➡

M. Harding,
fol. 341. b.

Farther he saith, “What reason or scripture have ye, that a piece of bread and a cup of wine can set the death and resurrection of Christ, as it were, before your eyes? Verily, when all your tale is told, ye seem to say nothing else but that the body of Christ remaineth in heaven, and that we must send up our souls thither to eat it there by a certain imagination, which ye call faith.”

Here ye do great wrong, M. Harding, to call the *faith of Christ an imagination*, or, as I trow ye mean, *a fancy*. St. Paul saith: *Fides est substantia rerum sperandarum*: “Faith is” (not an imagination, but) “the *substance* and ground of the things that we hope for.” If ye travel once again to Rome, being thus far instructed already, ye will easily learn the lesson, that one of your late popes there, as it is reported, taught his cardinals, *O quantum nobis profuit illa fabula de Christo!*

That we ought to send up our faith into heaven, and there to embrace the body of Christ, it is St. Augustine’s doctrine: it is not ours. These be his words: *Dices*,

Aug. in Jo-
han. tract. 50.
[iii. pt. 2. p.
630.]

[1. respondent] *Quomodo tenebo Christum absentem? Quomodo in cælum manum mittam, ut ibi sedentem teneam? Fidem mitte, et tenuisti. Parentes tui tenuerunt carne: tu tene corde: "Thou wilt say, How shall I hold Christ being absent? How shall I reach my hand into heaven, that I may hold him sitting there? Send up thy faith, and thou holdest him. Thy fathers (the Jews) held him in the flesh: hold him thou in thy heart."*

But, forasmuch as M. Harding thought it sufficient so pleasantly to pass over this matter with his *imagination*s and *fancies*, I think it therefore so much the more needful to shew the judgment of the ancient learned fathers in this behalf.

Aug. de Trin.
lib. 13. cap. 7.
[viii. 928.]

First therefore St. Augustine saith: *Rerum absentium, præsens est fides: et rerum quæ foris sunt, intus est fides: et rerum quæ non videntur, videtur fides:* "Of things that be *absent*, faith is present: of things that be without, faith is within: and of things that be not seen, faith is seen."

Aug. in Ps.
75. [iv. 801.]

Again he saith: *Cum non obliviscimur munus Salvatoris, nonne nobis quotidie Christus immolatur?.....Ex ipsis reliquiis cogitationis nostræ, id est, ex ipsa memoria, Christus quotidie nobis sic immolatur, quasi quotidie nos innovet:* "When we forget not the gift of our Saviour, is not Christ offered unto us every day? Of the very *remnants of our thoughts*, that is to say, of our very *memory*, Christ is so daily offered unto us, as though he renewed us every day."

Hieron. de 7.
Ordinib. Eccl.
De gradu. 7.
[v. 108.]

And, the more lively to express this matter, St. Hierom saith: *Tibi convivium Christus est: cogitatio Christus est: gaudium Christus est: desiderium Christus est: lectio Christus est: quies Christus est:* "Christ is thy banquet: Christ is thy thought: Christ is thy joy: Christ is thy desire: Christ is thy reading: Christ is thy rest³²." Like-

Ambr. de Vir-
ginib. lib. 2.
[cap. 2. ii.
166.]

wise St. Ambrose: *In animis [l. mentibus] vestris quotidie pro redemptione corporis Christus offertur:* "In your minds Christ is daily offered for the redemption of the body."

And to pass over others, for that it pleaseth M. Harding to make himself such mirth with *imagination*s: Euthymius, a Greek author, writing purposely of this matter, saith

³² [S. Hieron. de 7. Ordin. This work is spurious.]

thus: *Non oportet simpliciter ea intueri.....sed aliud quid-* Euthym. in
Johan. cap.
9. [vol. iv.
p. 257.]
dam imaginari, et interioribus oculis ea perspicere, tanquam
mysteria: "We may not look barely upon these things,"
(that is, upon the bread and wine,) "but must thereof
imagine some other matter, and behold the same with our
inward spiritual eyes, as it is meet to behold mysteries."
This spiritual *imagination*, this *having*, this *holding*, this
enjoying of Christ, it liketh well M. Harding in his plea-
sance to scorn as a phantasy. But St. Augustine saith:
Magis sunt illa, quæ intelligimus, quam ista, quæ cernimus: Augustin.
epist. 117.
[ii. 6.]
"The things that we *understand*" (or imagine by faith) "are
more certain, than the things that we see *with our eyes*."

Neither may you think, M. Harding, that, these things
being granted, *the ministration of the holy supper would*
be superfluous. For these two kinds of eating must ever-
more necessarily be joined together. And whosoever
cometh to the holy table, and advanceth not his mind unto
heaven, there to feed upon Christ's body at the right hand
of God, he knoweth not the meaning of these mysteries,
but is void of understanding, as the horse or the mule, and
receiveth only the bare sacraments to his condemnation.
Therefore the mystical supper of Christ, notwithstanding
this doctrine, is not superfluous: but your *transubstantia-*
tion, your *real presence*, and a great part of this your idle
talk, is most vain and most superfluous.

But ye say, "How can bread and wine bring us to the
hope of resurrection or of everlasting life?" And why may
not a man in like manner demand of you, How can a few
drops of cold *water* bring us to the hope of resurrection?
If *water* may do it, why may not *bread* and *wine* likewise
do it?

Touching the *water*, St. Basil saith: *Baptismus est po-*
tentia (Dei) ad resurrectionem: "Baptism is the *power of* Basil. de
Sancto Ba-
ptismo. [ii.
114.]
God to resurrection." Again he saith: *Resurrectionis*
gratiam in die resurrectionis recipiamus: "Upon the day
of resurrection let us receive" (baptism, which is) "*the*
grace of resurrection." St. Hierom saith: *Non solum pro-* † Hieronym.
in 1 Cor. xv.
[v. 1008.]
pter remissionem peccatorum baptizamur [leg. *baptizantur*],
sed etiam propter resurrectionem carnis nostræ: "We are

baptized, not only for remission of sins, but also for the *resurrection of our flesh*." And therefore the Greeks call baptism ἀφθαρσίας ἐνδυμα, that is, the *weed of immortality*³².

Dionys. cap.
2.

Here, M. Harding, it were some point of skill to shew us how so great power may be in so little *water*. Howbeit it is not the *water* indeed, that worketh the force of resurrection, but the *blood* of Christ that is signified by the *water*. And therefore St. Ambrose saith: *Baptismus resurrectionis pignus et imago est*: "Baptism is the *pledge* and *image* of resurrection"³³. Likewise Ignatius: *Credentes in mortem ejus, per baptismum participes resurrectionis ejus efficitur*: "Believing in the death of Christ, *by baptism*, we are made partakers of his resurrection." The like we say of the *holy supper*. Neither is M. Harding able to shew us any sufficient cause to the contrary, but *wine* or *bread* may have this power, as well as *water*. Of this whole matter we shall speak hereafter more at large.

Ambros. in
Epist. ad
Rom. cap. 6.
[ii. app. 59.]
Ignatius ad
Trallianos.
[Interp. ed.
Russel, ii.
154.]

But if *bread* and *wine*, as M. Harding saith, have no power to work resurrection, what power then can his *accidents* and empty *forms* have to work the same? For, as touching the body of Christ itself, his own doctors could have told him, that it entereth not into our bodies. For thus it is noted and published for sound and certain doctrine upon the decrees: *Certum est, quod quam cito species teruntur dentibus, tam cito in cælum rapitur corpus Christi*: "It is certain and out of doubt, that, as soon as the accidents or forms are touched with the teeth, straightway the *body of Christ* is taken up into heaven."

De Con. dist.
2. Tribus
gradib: in
glossa.

Hereof we may reason thus: Christ's body is suddenly taken up into heaven, and is not received into our bodies: and that, as it is noted here, *is true and certain*. The bread and wine, by M. Harding's doctrine, are utterly consumed, no part of the substance thereof remaining: there is nothing left there, but *forms* and *accidents*. Hereof it must needs follow, by this doctrine, that the same bare *forms* and *accidents*, being received into our bodies,

³³ [These Commentaries were erroneously ascribed to St. Ambrose.]

³⁴ [There is some mistake in this reference to Dionys. cap. 2.]

have power to work our resurrection. But it is well known and confessed in all schools, that the substance is better and worthier than is the accident. Therefore we may conclude thus: *The accident of bread may do it: ergo, the substance of bread may much more do it.*

For the rest, M. Harding saith: "The substance of the bread is quite removed; the roundness and whiteness are the sacrament; the thing thereof is of two sorts; the one contained and signified, the other signified and not contained." These mystical fancies may lie still, until M. Harding, by some authority other than his own, have proved them better. True it is, that M. Harding saith, Between the sacrament and the thing itself, that is to say, between the *sacrament* and the *body* of Christ represented by the sacrament, there is great difference. For indeed and verily, and in precise manner of speech, neither is Christ's *body* the *sacrament*, nor is the *sacrament* Christ's body.

St. Augustine saith, as it is alleged before: *Nisi sacramenta similitudinem quandam earum rerum, quarum sacramenta sunt, haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent. Ex hac autem similitudine plerunque rerum ipsarum nomina accipiunt. Itaque secundum quendam modum sacramentum corporis Christi, corpus Christi est:* "Unless sacraments had a certain likeness of the things whereof they be sacraments, without question they were no sacraments. And in consideration of this likeness, oftentimes they bear the names of the things themselves. Therefore *after a certain manner of speech*" (and not otherwise) "*the sacrament of the body of Christ, is Christ's body.*"

Hereof I have written more at large, as occasion was offered, in my former Reply to M. Harding. St. Ambrose, noting this difference, saith thus: *Non iste panis, qui vadit in ventrem: sed panis vite æternæ, qui animæ nostræ substantiam fulcit:* "Not this bread" (of the sacrament) "that passeth into the belly; but" (the body of Christ itself, which is) "*the bread of everlasting life:* which relieveth the substance of our soul," and is signified by the sacrament. Rabanus Maurus saith: *Aliud est sacra-*

Augustin.
Epist. 23. ad
Bonifacium.
[ii. 267.]

Articul. 21.
[supr. vol. iii.
p. 414.]
De Con. dist.
2. Non iste.

Rabanus, [de
Cler. Inst.]
lib. i. cap. 31.
[tom. vi. p.
11.]

mentum, aliud vis sacramenti. Sacramentum in corporis alimentum redigitur : virtute sacramenti æternæ vitæ dignitas adipiscitur : “The sacrament is one thing : the power of the sacrament is another thing. The sacrament is changed into the food or nourishment of the body : by the virtue of the sacrament is gotten the dignity of everlasting life.”

Chrysost. in
Matt. hom.
11. [Op. Im-
perf. vi. 63.]

Likewise St. Chrysostom: *In sacris* [al. *sanctificatis*] *vasis, non ipsum* [al. *verum*] *corpus Christi, sed mysterium corporis ejus continetur :* “In the holy vessels is contained, not the very body of Christ itself, but a mystery or sacrament of his body³³.”

So great difference there is between the sacrament and the body of Christ. The sacrament passeth into the belly : Christ’s body passeth into the soul. The sacrament is upon earth : Christ’s body is in heaven. The sacrament is corruptible : Christ’s body is glorious. The sacrament is the sign : Christ’s body is the thing signified. For want of this distinction M. Harding wandereth blindly in the dark, he woteth not whither. Therefore St. Augustine saith, speaking purposely hereof: *Ea demum est miserabilis animæ servitus, signa pro rebus accipere :* “This is a miserable bondage of the soul, to take the signs instead of the things that be signified.”

Augustin. de
Doctrina
Christ. lib. 3.
cap. 5. [iii.
47.]

Whether, and in what sense, the wicked may be said to eat the body of Christ, it shall be discussed hereafter more at large.

As for M. Harding’s ordinary conclusion, of “wresting the scriptures and holy fathers :” of “playing false lessons :” of “teaching,” as he saith, “horrible lies :” and of “subverting the people,” with all other the like furniture, we will leave it freely and wholly unto the author.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 12. Divis. 2.

To this banquet we think the people of God^[Vol. iv. p. 22.] ought to be earnestly bidden, that they may all communicate among themselves, and openly declare

³³ [See the note ²⁹ supra vol. iii. 435.]

and testify both the godly society, which is among them, and also the hope which they have in Christ Jesus. For this cause, if there had been any, which would be but a looker on, and abstain from the holy communion, him did the old fathers and bishops of Rome in the primitive church, before private mass came up, excommunicate as a wicked person, and as a pagan. Neither was there any Christian at that time which did communicate alone, whiles other looked on. For so did Calixtus³⁴ in times past decree, "that, after the consecration was finished, all should communicate, except they had rather stand without the church doors. For thus," saith he, "did the apostles appoint, and the same the holy church of Rome keepeth still."

M. HARDING.

Let this banquet be dight as it ought to be ; let the best dish be made ready in due sort, which is the very body of our Saviour Christ ; let the guests be told, what is set before them at that holy table ; let them be taught to believe rightly, to prove and prepare themselves as behoveth ; then we think it most convenient the people of God be bidden thereto, not thereby to communicate among themselves only, but also, and rather to communicate with God, to be incorporate in Christ, and to be made partakers of all the benefits of God procured to man by the death of his Son, suffered in that body, which at this high feast they eat. This banquet being thus set forth, if some devout persons think themselves for good causes unworthy to assay thereof, and to receive that heavenly food sacramentally, finding themselves not so well prepared as St. Paul requireth in that behalf, yet for love of it desire to be present and behold that table, and spiritually to taste of that healthful dish by faith, charity, prayer, and fervent devotion, wherein they do not wholly abstain from the holy communion : such ^a are not to be condemned as idle lookers on, for so ye make them, nor to be driven out of the church. Neither did ever the old fathers and bishops of Rome in the primitive church (say what ye will, defenders,) excommunicate them, much less did they repute them for ^b wicked persons and pagans. And ^c not seldom the priest at the mass,

a Untruth : for the catholic fathers condemned them.

b Untruth : for St. Chrysostom calleth them : *Impudentes et improbos.* Ad Ephes. hom. 3.

c Untruth, coldly avouched. Read the answer.

³⁴ [This decree is attributed to Calixtus by Gratian ; in the margin it is stated, that the same is found in Anacleti epist. 1.]

(which for this respect with unreasonable novelty ye term "private,") when none other were disposed to receive with him sacramentally, but spiritually only, hath received alone the holy things, which he hath offered.

Neither the decree of Anacletus, which ye, being deceived by Gratian, ^duntruly father upon Calixtus, requireth that ^dall the people present should communicate with the priest at the mass. Which thing ye should not have objected to the church, seeing that it is not observed by your own new order in your congregations. Read the epistle of Anacletus, from whence this decree is taken, and yourselves will confess the same. That holy father and martyr prescribeth the order, which he would to be kept, when bishops or priests say mass: which was, that it be done in places consecrated to God, that a bishop at his mass have witnesses with him no more than another priest. In the ^dsolemn feasts he requireth seven, five, or three deacons, likewise sub-deacons, and other ministers, all clothed in hallowed vestments, to attend upon him, to stand on every side of him with a contrite heart and humble spirit, looking downward, keeping him from malicious men, giving consent to his sacrifice. Thus much being declared in that epistle, it followeth immediately: *Peracla autem consecratione*, &c.: "And when the consecration is ended, let them all communicate, that will not be kept without the church doors. For so the apostles have ordained, and the holy church of Rome observeth." Who seeth not this request of receiving the com-

^d Untruths three together, as shall appear.

^e Untruth, plain and manifest. Read the answer.

munion to be referred ^eto the priests, deacons, sub-deacons and other ministers, in solemn feasts, serving the bishop at mass? For in that place Anacletus speaketh never a word expressly of the lay-people. Therefore ye deceive the unlearned reader with a lie.....

^f Untruth. For in the apostles' canons it is written thus: *Quicumque fideles ingrediuntur in ecclesiam*, &c. can. 10. [al. can. 9.]

For the better understanding of this decree, specially whereas Anacletus allegeth the apostles' ordinance for the same, the ninth canon of the apostles is to be considered: in which they require ^fevery ecclesiastical person to be partaker of the sacrifice that is offered, or to be excluded from the communion, unless he shew just cause for the contrary. The reason whereof in that canon expressed is this: Lest the clerks, abstaining from the communion, should be occasion of offence to the people, and thereby raise an evil suspicion against him that sacrificed, as though he had not made the oblation as it ought to be.

This commandment of receiving the communion given by Anacletus pertaineth only to the ministers of the church in solemn feasts. See the 9th [al. 8th] canon of the apostles.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

"Let this banquet be dight," saith M. Harding, "as it ought to be: let the best dish be made ready." Good Christian reader, the best, the wholesomest, the most pleasant, and most comfortable dish at this table, is the death of Christ, that Lamb of God, that hath taken away the sins of the

world. Thus Christ himself, the Master of this feast, hath willed us to dress this dinner: "Do this," saith he, "in remembrance of me." Likewise St. Paul: "As often as ye shall eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, ye shall shew forth and publish the Lord's death until he come." 1 Cor. xi. 25, 26.

This banquet therefore is not the outward or bare sacrament, but Christ's *very body and blood*, which are represented unto us by the sacrament: and, as it is before alleged out of St. Ambrose: "It is not the bread" (of the sacrament) "*that passeth into the belly, but the bread of everlasting life*, which relieveth the substance of the soul." De Con. dlist. 2. Non iste.

Therefore St. Hierom saith: *Judaicas fabulas repellamus, et ascendamus cum Domino (in) cœnaculum magnum stratum atque mundatum, et accipiamus ab eo sursum calicem novi testamenti*: Hieronym. ad Hedibiam: in Quæst. secund. [iv. 172.]

"Let us abandon from us Jewish fables, and let us ascend up with our Lord into heaven, into that great parlour drest and made clean: and there above let us receive of him the cup of the new testament." In this sense

St. Cyprian saith: *Vident hæc sacramenta pauperes spiritu, et hoc uno contenti ferculo, omnes hujus mundi delicias aspernantur: et possidentes Christum, aliquam hujus mundi possidere suppellectilem dedignantur*: Cyprian. [Arnold.] de Cœna Dom. [app. cxv.]

"The poor in spirit see these sacraments, and being contented with this only dish, they despise all other the dainty fares of the world: and having possession of Christ, they disdain to possess any worldly substance." In like sort, speaking of the

birth of Christ, he saith thus: *Ea quæ licita sunt et concessa, tangamus: et circa incunabula Salvatoris primæ infantie ejus fercula degustemus*: "Let us touch those things that be lawful for us to touch: and standing about the cradle of our Saviour, let us taste of the first dish of his childhood." Cyprian. [Arnold.] de Nativitate Christi: in Prologo. [app. lxxviii.]

Likewise saith St. Augustine: *Cæcus interior panem Christum non videt. Et beatus est? Hoc non dicit, nisi pariter cæcus*: Augustin. in Psal. lvii. [iv. 557.]

"He, that is blind in his heart within, seeth not Christ that is our bread. And is he blessed? No man will so say, unless it be one as blind as he."

But what manner of feast is it, that M. Harding prepareth for the people? how is it seasoned? how is it drest? First,

by very uncourteous and uncivil dealing, he withdraweth the one half, that is, the *cup of the new testament*, and reserveth it severally to himself: and yet would make the people believe they have the whole. And thus doth he, when he hath greatest company to sup with him, and when his feast is best furnished. Otherwise he suffereth his guests to stand aloof, and he consumeth all his provision himself alone. Neither indeed hath he any thing to set before them, saving only a cold surcharge of *dead shows* and *dumb ceremonies*. The poor people heareth nothing, understandeth nothing, eateth nothing, drinketh nothing, tasteth nothing. They publish not the Lord's death: they know not the Lord's supper.

Suidas [in
voce].

To such a banquet Pasctes [l. Pases] the juggler used sometimes to call his friends. There was a great show of variety, and plenty of all manner of meats and drinks, the table full. But when any of the guests would have touched any thing, it vanished suddenly away, and was turned to nothing. And so, when their eyes were full, they put up their knives, and rose a-hungred. Even thus M. Harding feedeth and feasteth the people of God with shows and ceremonies, and suffereth them in the mean while to starve for hunger. Even as the prophet saith: "It shall be like the dream of an hungry man. Behold he eateth and maketh merry: but when he is awaked, his soul is empty."

Isa. xlix. 8.

"Good men," saith M. Harding, "withdraw themselves, and are contented to be present only, and to stand by: but receive not the sacrament." But Chrysostom saith to such a good devout man: "If thou stand by, and do not communicate, thou art (*wicked*, thou art) *shameless*, thou art *impudent*.....Thou wilt say, *I am unworthy* to be partaker of the holy mysteries. Then art thou *unworthy* to be partaker of the prayers³⁵.....Thou mayest no more *stand here, than one of the novices, called 'catechumeni'*³⁶, that never was christened."

Chrysost. ad
Ephes. hom.
3. [xi. 23. 24.]

Impudens,
improbis.

³⁵ [This is not one passage, but several, taken out of different parts of the same homily. See some of the original printed supra vol. i. p. 201, note ³⁷, and p. 332 note ⁴⁵.]

³⁶ [In the ed. of 1567, this was translated "heathen," which Harding calls "an heathenish interpretation."]

Addition.

Addition. ¶ M. Harding. "A wise man, as M. Jewel M. Harding, fol. 342 b. taketh himself to be, would understand, that, how earnestly soever Chrysostom speaketh, to provoke those that were present to communicate,.....his words import a counsel, rather than a precept." *The answer.* I need not to tell you, M. Harding, what you take yourself to be. St. Chrysostom saith: "Whosoever standeth by, refusing to communicate, is wicked and shameless, and unworthy to be partaker of the prayers: after the communion is ended, thou mayest lawfully come and see: but while the mysteries are present, depart thee hence. Thou mayest no more be here, than a *catechumenus*, or a *novice*, that never was baptized." Do all these words import only a *counsel*, M. Harding, and *no commandment*? Anacletus saith: "Let De Con. dist. 2. Peract. them all communicate, unless they will be thrust out of the church." The apostles in their canons say thus: can. 10. [al. 9.] "Whoso entereth into the church, and heareth the scriptures, and receiveth not the communion, let him be excommunicate, as a disturber of the church, and a breaker of order." Thomas of Aquine saith: *Statutum fuit, ut* [Aqu. Summ. part. 3. qu. 80. art. 10.] *fideles quotidie communicarent*: "It was a decree, that the faithful should communicate every day." It was a "decree," saith Thomas, it was an "ordinance," it was a "law," it was a "statute." Yet must we say for your pleasure, that matters of *excommunication* and *disturbance* of the church, *decrees*, *laws*, *ordinances* and *statutes*, are only *counsels*, and *no commandments*? Happy are you, that have such power to change the nature of things, and so easily of *counsels* to make *commandments*, and of *commandments* to make *counsels*, when you list. ¶

Here, gentle reader, mayest thou see a marvellous change in the church of God. The thing, that in old times was accounted *heathenish*, *impudency*, and *wickedness*, is now, by M. Harding's new divinity, become *godliness* and *great devotion*.

But, God wot, here followeth a very cold asseveration. "Not seldom," ye say, "the priest at the mass, when none Not seldom. other were disposed, received alone." O, M. Harding, the world well seeth, your word is no gospel. It appeareth

by your so many untruths, ye care not greatly what you say. Thus ye tell us: "Not seldom the priest received alone." "Not seldom!" What is that? why speak you so nicely? what meaneth this cold and doubtful eloquence, specially in him that otherwise hath acquainted his voice to speak so big? why say you not, The priest used *daily* and *commonly* so to do? or, if ye could not avouch so great untruth for very shame, why said you not, The priest *oftentimes*, or at some *certain times* received alone: at the least at *four*, or *three*, or *two* sundry times, within the space of six hundred years? At the worst, if ye had said but *once*, it had been somewhat. As for "not seldom," it is too base: it is too simple: it disgraceth the whole course of your pleading, and in plain speech soundeth as much as *never*. It had rather been your part, taking upon you this countenance of credit and gravity, to have told us substantially and plainly, what manner of man this priest was: where he dwelt: what was his name: when and where, and in what company he said this mass: who saw it: who heard it: who bare witness to it: by what record or authority it may be proved. The matter being so great, and of such antiquity, is there no man left behind to witness the same, but M. Harding? In your former Answer ye bring us in *boys*, *girls*, *sick folk*, *lay people*, and *women*: and upon such grounds ye stick not to found your private mass. And doubtless these examples might have seemed to stand you in some pretty stead, if in those days *boys* and *women* had been *priests*. For *priest* or *bishop*, that ever received the sacrament alone in the church, before the people, ye are not yet able to shew us one. As for your Leontius, and Amphilocheus, and S. Basil's Mass at Midnight, and other like follies and fables, it seemeth by the silence ye use in your late Rejoinder, ye are contented wisely and quietly to give them over.

[Supra vol. i.
335.]

Ye say: "We are deceived by Gratian, and have placed Calixtus instead of Anacletus." Here first of all, ye confess, that Gratian your great *rabbīn*, the father and fountain of your *decrees*, might be deceived. And verily such plainness in dealing, if ye would vouchsafe to use it oftener,

were worthy of some commendation. For indeed your Gratian, as he was a man of great reading and small judgment, so he allegeth oftentimes, he knoweth not what : Hierom for Origen, Cyprian for Augustine, Beda for Ambrose, Juvencus for Vincentius, Greek for Latin, new for old. As for this authority, wherein you say, we are deceived, he allegeth it in two sundry places : first under the name of Anacletus, next under the name of Calixtus : meaning, I trow, if there were error in the one, at least to redress it by the other. Therefore, M. Harding, if ye had looked better upon your book, whatsoever opinion ye have of Gratian your doctor, ye should have found, that we, for our part, were nothing deceived. Howbeit, your Gratian, instead of one error, hath made two. For indeed, as it is true, that these words were never written by Calixtus : so, of the other side, it is likewise true, they were never written by Anacletus : but were manifestly forged and falsified by others that followed afterward : as in my former Reply I have declared more at large.

De Con. dist.
1. Episcopus.
De Con. dist.
2. Peracta.

Art. 4. divis.
3. [Supra
vol. ii. 136.]

But it is a world to see, what wiles and shifts these men can find to bear out error. “First,” ye say, “these words were spoken of the priests, deacons, and sub-deacons, serving the priest at mass upon solemn feasts.” Pardon me, M. Harding, to say the truth. For verily, notwithstanding this solemn tale, it seemeth, ye know not what ye say. For it may please you to remember, that your Anacletus, whose forged authority ye have alleged, was bishop in Rome in the time of St. Peter, shortly upon the death of Christ, when the church was every where under persecution, and full of blood. Now, I pray you, who ever told you, either of any office that your *sub-deacons* had in the holy ministry, or of any great high *holy days*, of *duplex*, or *magis duplex*, or principal *solemn feast* in the church of God, in all that time ? may we think, that the blessed Virgin’s and the apostles’ days were kept high and holy, while the same blessed Virgin and apostles were yet alive ? Though ye had none other regard, either to God, or to yourself, yet shame should force you to foresee more advisedly what you say.

But your greatest folly appeareth in the shifting and glossing of these words. For you say : “This Calixtus or

Anacletus speaketh only of the priests, the deacons, and the sub-deacons: and never a word expressly of the lay-people:" and "therefore," ye say, "we deceive the unlearned reader with a lie." Touching your uncourteous speech, I weigh it none otherwise but as it is. The truth will be able evermore to bear itself. But, that these words of Anacletus or Calixtus touch not the lay people, but only the priests and the ministers, the very Glosser himself was never, either so unskilful, or so impudent so to say. For, whereas the words be these: "Let them all *communicate*, unless they will be removed out of the church," he setteth thereto this exposition: *Hoc antiquum est: nam hoc hodie relictum videtur arbitrio cujuslibet*: "This was the old manner: for nowadays it is free for every man to do therein what he will."

De Con. dist.
2. Peracta.
In Glossa.

The like decree is found under the name of the Apostles' Canons: *Quicumque fideles ingrediuntur in ecclesiam, et scripturas audiunt, non autem perseverant in oratione, nec sanctam communionem percipiunt, velut qui ordinis perturbationem commovent, ab ecclesiæ communione arceri convenit*: "As many" (not only of the priests and ministers, but) "of the faithful people as come into the church and hear the scriptures, but continue not out the prayers, nor receive the holy communion, let them be put from the communion of the church, as men that work the breach of order³⁷." Likewise it is noted in the margin upon the same canons: *Omnes olim, qui intererant, communicabant*: "In old times, all that were present did communicate." In the council of Antioch it was decreed thus: *Omnes, qui ingrediuntur in ecclesiam Dei, et sacras scripturas audiunt, aversantur autem perceptionem Domini sacramenti, &c. ab ecclesia abjici oportet, &c.*: "All that come into the church of God, and hear the holy scriptures, and refuse the receiving of the Lord's sacrament, let them be put from the church." These decrees reach not only to the ministers of the church, but also to the whole people.

Canon. A-
post. can. 10.
[al. can. 9.]

Canon. A-
post. can. 9.
in margine.
[ed. Crabb.]
Concil. Anti-
ochen. can. 2.
[il. 1309.]
Concil. A-
quisgran.
cap. 70. [xiv.
201.]

Clemens, that was bishop in Rome, as it is thought, next after this Anacletus, saith thus: *Tanta in altario holo-*

³⁷ [See vol. i. pp. 184 and 231, and the notes.]

causta offerantur, quanta populo sufficere debeant: "Let so many loaves be offered at the altar, as may suffice to serve" (not only the ministers, but also) "the people³⁸."

St. Ambrose saith: *Munus oblatum totius populi fit: quia in uno pane omnes significantur. Per idem enim, quod unum sumus, de uno pane omnes sumere oportet*: "The oblation offered is made the whole people's: for that in one bread all are signified. For in that we are all one, we must all receive of one bread³⁹."

St. Chrysostom saith unto the people: *Neque nos abundantius, vos autem minus, de sacra mensa participamus: sed pariter, et ex æquo illam utrique degustamus*: "Neither do we receive more, and you less of the holy table: but we taste thereof equally both together." The like might be alleged out of St. Hierom, St. Augustine, Dionysius, and others.

But forasmuch as ye so bitterly tell us, that "we misconstrue these words of Anacletus, and deceive the unlearned reader with a lie," may it therefore please you further to hear, what your own late *scholastical doctors* have written and judged in this behalf.

Thomas of Aquine saith: *In primitiva ecclesia, quando magna vigeat devotio fidei Christianæ, statutum fuit, ut fideles quotidie communicarent*: "In the primitive church, when great devotion of the Christian faith was in strength, it was ordained, that the faithful should receive the communion every day." Durandus saith: *In primitiva ecclesia omnes fideles quotidie communicabant*: "In the primitive church all the faithful daily received the communion."

Hugo Cardinalis saith: *In primitiva ecclesia omnes, quot quot intererant canonis missæ, singulis diebus communicabant. Et, si nollent communicare, egrediebantur post offertorium*: "In the primitive church, as many as were present at the canon of the mass did daily communicate: and, if they would not, they departed forth after the offertory."

If ye think these authorities are not sufficient, Johannes Cochläus saith: *Omnes olim, tum sacerdotes, tum laici, cum sacrificante communicabant, sicut ex canonibus aposto-*

† Clemens,
epist. 2.
[Crabb. i. 41.]

Ambros. in
1 Cor. xl. [H.
app. 149.]

Chrysost. in
2 Thess.
hom. 4. [xl.
535.]

[In Summ.
part. 3. qu.
80. art. 10.]

Durandus in
Rational. lib.
4. cap. 55. 1.

Hugo [de
Scto Charo.]
Cardinal. in
Luc. cap. 24.
[tom. v. 251.]

Johan. Coch.
contra Mus-
cul. De sacri-
ficio.

³⁸ [Supra vol. i. 169.]

³⁹ [Supra vol. i. 159, note.]

lorum, et ex libris antiquissimorum ecclesiæ doctorum perspicue cognoscitur. Hic unicum hac de re canonem recitabo, qui Calixto adscribitur: Peracta, &c.: "In old times, both all the priests and all the lay people received the communion with the minister that had made the oblation: as it is plainly perceived by the canons of the apostles, and by the books of the ancient doctors of the church. One canon hereof I will allege, written by Calixtus³⁷," &c. Likewise saith Judocus Clichtoveus: In primitiva ecclesia fideles quotidie sumebant communionem, secundum illam Calixti sanctionem, Peracta, &c.: "In the primitive church the faithful received the communion every day, according to this decree of Calixtus³⁸, &c.

Judocus
Clichthov.
in Canon.
Missæ.

Here you may see, not only that these words are alleged by your own doctors, under the name of Calixtus, wherein you have noted so great an error, but also that the same words, by the judgment of the same doctors, are thought to pertain no less to the lay people, than to the priest.

Now, M. Harding, these things considered, I refer the indifferent judgment hereof to your own knowledge and conscience, whether of us two hath deceived the reader with a lie.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 12. Divis. 3.

Moreover, when the people cometh to the holy communion, the sacrament ought to be given them in both kinds: for so both Christ hath commanded, and the apostles in every place have ordained, and all the ancient fathers and catholic bishops have followed the same. And whoso doth contrary to this, he, as Gelasius saith, "committeth sacrilege." And therefore we say, that our adversaries at this

[Vol. iv. p. 22.]

De Con. dist.
2. Comperi-
mus.

³⁷ [The Editor has not had access to the Lat. ed. of this work; but he has found the passage, very exactly rendered, in the German ed. (in the Bodl.) entitled, "Vertheidigung unsers Priesterthumbs und Opfers . . . wider zwu Predig Wolfgang Meusslins." durch D. Johan. Cocleus. 1544.]

³⁸ [In the second book of Antilutherus by J. Clichtoveus entitled *De Missæ Officio* (p. 70), there is a passage resembling this, but with the general expression "ex constitutione ecclesiastica," instead of "secundum illam Calixti sanctionem."]

day, who, having violently thrust out, and quite forbidden the *holy communion*, do, without the word of God, without the authority of any ancient council, without any catholic father, without any example of the primitive church, yea and without reason also, defend and maintain their *private masses*, and the mangling of the sacraments, and do this, not only against the plain express commandment of Christ, but also against all antiquity, do wickedly therein, and are very church-robbers.

M. HARDING.

Soft and fair, masters. Ye shew more heat than wit, more stomach than learning, more anger than reason. Ye say much, and prove little. But say ye, and say again what ye will : we tell you boldly, that ^a neither Christ ever commanded, ^a nor the apostles ordained, ^a nor all the ancient fathers observed, that the sacrament be given to the people none otherwise, but under both kinds only. If Christ had expressly commanded it, the church (*of Rome*) had not so long time received and kept the use of one kind. The apostles and sundry holy fathers ministered both kinds, we confess. That the one kind was not also by them ministered, and that it is utterly unlawful, we deny, ^b and the same shall ye never be able to prove. Touching this whole point, and how little that ye allege out of Gelasius maketh for you, and concerning mass not to be omitted for lack of company, to communicate sacramentally with the priest : ^c I have said enough in my answer to your fellow M. Jewel his challenge. Bring ye other stuff, and better than this, or else all the world will see your halting, and the feebleness of your side. That we have violently thrust out, and quite forbidden the holy communion, unless ye mean your own schismatical, mutable, and polluted communion, if there were any spark of shame, or hatred of lying in you, ye would never impute it unto us. God doth know, and the world is not unwitting, ^d how much, how often, and how earnestly the catholic church exhorteth her children to prepare themselves to receive their ^e Maker. And though the people of England of late years resorted not commonly thereto, yet the devotion of Christian folk in this country of Base Almain, in France, in Italy, in Spain, and in sundry other Christian provinces, is so fervent in frequenting the holy communion, as, if ye saw it, ye would be ashamed of your slanderous report. Let wise men and good men judge, whether we be church-robbers, or ye unshamefast liars.

Communion under both kinds not commanded expressly by Christ, nor ordained by the apostles.

^a Untruths, three together, boldly presumed.

^b To prove a negative it is a folly. But you shall never prove the affirmative.

^c Certainly enough. For in the same two Articles ye have uttered three score and four great untruths.

An unshamefast and slanderous lie.

^d Untruth, so sensible and so gross, that a man may feel it with his fingers.

^e Untruth. No learned father ever called the sacrament his God or Maker.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Where nothing is answered, it were not amiss to reply nothing. If M. Harding can only vouchsafe to call us "slandrous reporters, and unshamefast liars," and the Lord's supper a "schismatical, mutable, polluted communion," it is sufficient: the case needeth no farther proof. To this whole matter M. Harding saith "he hath sufficiently answered M. Jewel." He hath answered, I grant: but how sufficiently, the matter itself will declare. Howbeit, he may not in any wise forget, that in the same two short treatises³⁸ to M. Jewel, containing only two and forty little leaves of paper, he hath sent us over and published threescore and four notable and great untruths: whereof I think he hath no great cause so much to glory.

He saith: "That the sacrament should be delivered to the people in both kinds, neither Christ commanded it, nor the apostles ever ordained it." Thus M. Harding saith, only because it liketh him thus to say. Yet his own catholic doctors, and the chief champions of that side, say far otherwise. Gerardus Lorichius saith: *Ipsius sacramenti institutio vult, ut omnes una manducemus et bibamus*: "The very institution of the sacrament itself willeth, that we eat and drink all together³⁹."

And Ruardus Tapper, the dean of Louvain, saith thus: *Habito respectu ad sacramentum, ejusque perfectionem, magis conveniret, sub utraque specie fieri communionem, quam sub altera tantum. Hoc enim magis consonum est ejus institutioni, et integritati, et refectioni corporali: imo, et exemplo Christi, et patrum primitivæ ecclesiæ*: "Consideration had unto the sacrament, and to the perfection of the same, it were more convenient, that the communion were ministered under both kinds, than under one alone. For this were more agreeable to the institution and fulness thereof, and to the outward perfection of the body: yea

*De Missa
publica pro-
roganda.*

Cassander de
Utraque Spe-
cie, p. 29. [p.
1034.]

³⁸ [One of these "treaties" is probably the anonymous work alluded to above, vol. iv. p. 201, note 67. It contains thirty-two pages, as reprinted in London by Thos. Powell, 1562. The Editor pur-

poses to print this "Apologie of Private Mass," with bp. Jewel's answer, in an appendix to the present edition.]

³⁹ [The Editor has not succeeded in finding a copy of this work.]


and to the example both of Christ, and also of the fathers of the primitive church."

Certainly these words of Christ, "Drink ye all of this:" "Do this in my remembrance:" are very plain words of commandment and *institution*. Therefore Chrysostom saith:

Et in pane, et in calice Christus dixit, Hoc facite in meam commemorationem: "Christ both in the bread and also in the cup said, 'Do this in remembrance of me.'"

Likewise Theophylactus: *Tremendus calix pari cunctis conditione traditus est*: "The reverend cup is in equal manner delivered to all." And whereas Christ saith,

"Drink ye all of this:" Paschasius, to make the matter the plainer, putteth thereto these words: *Tam ministri, quam reliqui credentes*: "As well the ministers, as the rest of the faithful." In like manner St. Augustine saith: *Simul hoc sumimus: simul bibimus: quia simul vivimus*: "We receive together: we drink together: because we live together."

Addition.  M. Harding. "The literal sense of those words, 'Drink ye all of this,' was none other, than that the cup should be divided between all the twelve, in such sort that two or three of them should not drink it up, as thinking to have it filled again for the rest. But that Peter should so drink, as to leave some for John: and John so, as to leave some for Andrew: and so each man to leave some deal, till the very last man had drunk of that cup," &c. *The answer.* This is a mannerly kind of divinity, and meet to be noted by M. Harding for manner's sake.

M. Harding. "Paschasius in that place disputeth of spiritual eating or drinking, and saith, that as well the faithful people as the ministers must drink spiritually of this cup." *The answer.* O good reader, how long will M. Harding abuse thy simplicity? Verily Paschasius in that place wrote only of the sacrament, as M. Harding well knoweth. But he saith: *Solus Christus est, qui frangit hunc panem*: "It is Christ only, that breaketh this bread." Will you therefore say, M. Harding, he spake not of the sacrament? The next words following are these: *Per manus ministrorum distribuit credentibus*: "Christ divided the cup unto the faithful by the hands of the ministers." I beseech you, is this the ministration of the sacrament? or what will

Augustin.
contra Lite-
ras Petil. lib.
3. cap. 49.
[ix. 326.]
Chrysost. in
Matt. hom.
51. [vii. 517.]

you call it? Must Paschasius be forced to make spiritual ministers, spiritual hands, spiritual cups, spiritual receivers, spiritual believers, and all spiritual for your pleasure? But Paschasius saith: "Christ breaketh this bread." So St. Augustine saith of the sacrament of baptism: "It is Christ that baptizeth." And Chrysostom saith: "It is not the priest that baptizeth thee: it is God himself that holdeth thy head³⁹." Shall we therefore say, that these words belong nothing to the sacrament of outward baptism, but only to the inward and spiritual washing of the soul? Verily Paschasius is as clear as the sunbeams. Consider the whole circumstance of the place. He speaketh only of the sacrament. His words be evident: "Take and drink ye all of this, as well the ministers, as the rest of the faithful." Leave this vanity, M. Harding: it is meet for children. Manliness is more seemly for a man. ☞

Notwithstanding any promise of constancy made to the contrary, yet, I trust, M. Harding of his courtesy will believe either St. Chrysostom, or St. Augustine, or Theophylact, or Paschasius, or Lorichius, or Tapper, or his *new doctors*, or the *old*, or his own, or others. Otherwise, if he be fully determined to believe no man, it is reason that no man believe him.

Here have we Christ's *word*, Christ's *example*, Christ's *ordinance*: the *tradition*, *perfection*, and *institution* of the sacrament. Now let M. Harding shew us the authority of any one ancient father, either Greek or Latin, by whom it may appear, that Christ commanded the sacrament to be delivered to the people in one kind only, and not in both: or, that Christ appointed one order of receiving the sacrament for the priest, and another for the people: and it shall be sufficient: we will strive no further.

Perhaps he will say, Notwithstanding Christ's words be plain, yet they are not of force sufficient to bind us for ever. For so writeth cardinal Cusanus touching the self-same matter: *Scripturæ ad tempus adaptantur, et varie intelliguntur: ita ut uno tempore secundum currentem ecclesiæ [l. universalem] ritum exponantur: mutato vero ritu, iterum sententia mutetur*: "The scriptures are applied to the states

Nicol. Cusan.
epist. 2. ad
Bohemios.
[p. 833.]

³⁹ [Supra vol. ii. 338, note ³⁶; where the original is printed.]

of divers times, and so are taken in divers senses : so that at one time they are expounded according to the current order of the church : but the order of the church being changed, the sense of the scripture is likewise changed.”

So St. Augustine saith of the heretics the Manichees : *Expendunt ista, non in statera æqua divinarum scripturarum, sed in statera dolosa consuetudinum suarum* : “ They weigh these matters, not in the equal balance of the divine scriptures, but in the deceitful balance of *their own customs*.”

Of the like sort of heretics St. Hilary saith : *Qui ea quæ scripta sunt negas, quid restat, nisi ut ea quæ non scripta sunt, credas ?* “ Seeing thou deniest the things that be written in the scriptures, what remaineth there, but that thou must believe such things as be not written in the scriptures ?”

But where have these men the institution of their *half communion* ? who ordained it ? who commanded it ? what apostle, what ancient doctor, what holy father ever used it ? M. Harding himself was forced to confess, by the report of Leo, that the first known devisers and authors of it were the old heretics called the *Manichees*. Such is the *institution* and *antiquity* of their doctrine. It sprang first of heresy, and was founded by heretics.

Touching Gelasius, I have already in my former Reply said so much as then unto me seemed sufficient. The words be plain enough of themselves, and need no commentary : *Aut integra sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur. Quia divisio unius ejusdemque mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest pervenire* : “ Either let them receive *the whole sacraments*” (in both kinds) “ or else let them be driven from *the whole*.” By which words of Gelasius it may appear, that, wheresoever the sacrament is ministered in one kind only, there is only a pieced or a *half communion*, and not *the whole*.

Further M. Harding saith : “ God doth know how much, how often, and how earnestly the catholic church exhorteth her children to prepare themselves to receive their Maker.” O, M. Harding, why should you so fondly mock the world with so manifest follies ? by what words, by what examples

Augustin.
contra Epist.
Parmentiani,
lib. 3, cap. 2.
[ix. 61.]

Hilar. de Tri-
nitate, lib. 9.
[pp. 1005,
1006.]

M. Harding,
[Answer to
Chall.] fol.
48 b.
Leo, serm. 4.
De Quadra-
gesima. [i.
217.]

[Supra vol.
i. p. 431.]

De Con. dist.
2. Comperi-
mus.

Chrysost. ad
Popul. Anti-
och. hom. 61.
In Epist. ad
Ephes. hom.
3. [xi. 23, 24.]

exhort you them? when ever said you, as Chrysostom saith to the people: "Depart ye hence: ye have no more right to stand here than *heathens* and *infidels*: ye are *wicked*: ye are *shameless*: ye are *impudent*, that stand by, and will not communicate⁴⁰?" And if the catholic church *do so often and so earnestly exhort her children*, how is it then, that the pope and his cardinals do so seldom communicate, scarcely once through the year? may we think, that the pope and his cardinals be not the children of the church?

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
59. [iii. pt. 2.
603.]

Last of all ye say, "Ye exhort the people to receive their Maker." I beseech you, M. Harding, what scripture, what father, what doctor ever taught you thus to say? The *sacrament* is a *sacrament*: it is not God. It is the *bread of our Lord*, as St. Augustine saith: it is not *our Lord*³⁹. It is a creature corruptible: it is not the *Maker* of heaven and earth. Accursed is he, that giveth the name and glory of God unto a creature that is no God. St. Chrysostom saith: *Nolimus quæso Creatorem cum creatura confundere: ne illud audiamus, Servierunt creaturæ potius quam Creatori*: "Let us not confound the creature and the Creator both together: lest it be said of us, They have honoured a creature more than their Maker."

Chrysost. in
Johan. hom.
3. [viii. 31.]

M. Harding,
fol. 345 b.

Addition. ☞ M. Harding. "Good words, M. Jewel. *Addition.* Christ saith, 'He that eateth me shall live for me.' Was not he the Maker of heaven and earth? If he were, accursed be he, that denieth him so to be." *The answer.* Hereunto, M. Harding, we say, *Amen*. We know that Christ *is very God of very God*. But deceive not yourself. We speak now of the sacrament of Christ, and not of Christ. The sacrament is one thing, and Christ is another. We eat Christ only by faith: we eat the sacrament only with the mouth of our body. When Christ spake these

³⁹ [At first sight it might seem, as if bishop Jewel misrepresented St. Augustine (supra vol. iii. p. 529, note 25); but that father evidently distinguishes between the "panem Domini," which is here called the *sacrament*, and the "panem Dominum," that which the

faithful receive by means of the *sacrament*.]

⁴⁰ [The genuine Hom. ad Pop. Antiochen. are only 21. Supra i. 188, note 29. The original of the quotation from Chrysost. in Ephes. will be found printed, supra vol. i. 332, note 45.]

words, "He that eateth me shall live by me," he spake only of himself to be eaten spiritually by faith: but he spake not one word there of the sacrament. He, that knoweth not this, knoweth nothing.

But St. Augustine saith: "The sacrament is called *life*." M. Harding, fol. 346 a. What then? Yet he saith not, The sacrament is called *our Maker*. St. Paul saith: *Petra erat Christus*: "The Rock was Christ." Yet you may not so unadvisedly conclude hereof, that the same Rock was the *Maker of the world*.

Howbeit, as St. Augustine saith: "The sacrament of Christ's body was called *life*:" so he saith even in the same place: "The sacrament of baptism was called *salus*, salvation:" Augustin. de Peccator. Merit. et Remissione, lib. 1. cap. 24. [x. 19.]

and St. Cyprian calleth the same: "The fountain of life"⁴¹: and St. Chrysostom saith: "The baptism of Christ is Christ's blood"⁴². Cyprian. de Simplicitat. Prælat. [p. 197.]

This is no less than if they had said, Baptism is life. And yet none of them ever said, The water of baptism is our *Maker*. St. Augustine saith: *Plus est unus Deus, quam unus baptismus. Neque enim est baptismus Deus. Sed ideo magnum aliquid est, quia sacramentum est Dei*: "One God is more than one baptism." Chrysost. in Hebræ, hom. 16. [xii. 159.]

For baptism is not God. Yet is baptism a great thing, because it is a sacrament of God." Good words therefore, M. Harding: and spare these blasphemies. For Fulgentius saith: *Veritatem Dei tenere, est unum Deum colere: veritatem Dei in mendacium convertere, est creaturæ servire*: Augustin. de Unico Baptismo, cap. 5. [x. 531.]

"To hold the truth of God, is to worship the only God: to turn the truth of God into a lie, is to do homage to a creature." Fulgentius ad Donatum. [p. 221.]

"To hold the truth of God, is to worship the only God: to turn the truth of God into a lie, is to do homage to a creature." ☞

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 13. *Divis. 1.*

We affirm, that the bread and wine are the holy and heavenly mysteries of the *body and blood of Christ*, and that by them Christ himself, being the true *bread of eternal life*, is so presently given unto

⁴¹ [S. Cyprian. "vitæ fonte deserto vitalis et salutaris aquæ gratiam pollicentur." It appears to the Editor, that the phrase "vitæ fons" is intended to refer to

God.]

⁴² [Supra vol. iii. p. 8, note 7, where the exact words are printed. See also vol. iii. p. 362, note 62.]

us, as that by faith we verily receive his body and his blood. Yet say we not this so as though we thought that the nature and substance of the *bread and wine* is clearly changed, and goeth to nothing: as many have dreamed in these latter times, and yet could never agree among themselves upon their own dreams. For that was not Christ's meaning, that the *wheaten bread* should lay apart his own nature, and receive a certain new divinity: but that he might rather *change* us, and (to use Theophylact's words) might *transform* us into his body⁴². For what can be said more plainly, than that which Ambrose saith: "Bread and wine remain still the same they were before: and yet are changed into another thing⁴³:" or that which Gelasius saith: "The substance of the bread, or the nature of the wine, ceaseth not to be:" or that which Theodoretus saith: "After the consecration the mystical signs do not cast off their own proper nature: for they remain still in their former substance, form, and kind⁴⁴:" or that which Augustine saith: "That which ye see is the bread and cup, and so our eyes do tell us: but that which your faith requireth to be taught, is this, *The bread is the body of Christ, and the cup is his blood*⁴⁵:" or that which Origen saith: "The bread which is sanctified by the word of God, as touching the material substance thereof, goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the privy⁴⁶:" or that which Christ himself said, not only after the blessing of the

In Johan.
cap. 6. [p.
447.]

De Sacr. lib.
4. cap. 4. [ii.
369.]

Gelas. contra
Eutychetem.
[ap. Routh.
Opusc. ii.
139.]

In Dialog. 1.
et 2. [tom. iv.
85.]

In Sermon.
ad Infantes.
[v. 1103,
1104.]

In Matt.
hom. 15. [iii.
499.]

⁴² [Reply, supra vol. iii. p. 106, note ³³.]

⁴³ [Ambros. de Sacram. Supra vol. i. 188, note ³⁰.]

⁴⁴ [Theodreti Dialogg. See the original printed supra vol. iii. p. 8, note ⁶, and p. 57, note ⁴⁶. See also Routh's Opuscula, vol.

ii. 132, with the notes.]

⁴⁵ [Augustin. Sermon. ad Infant. Supra vol. ii. 329, note ²⁶.]

⁴⁶ Origen. in Matt. . . . καὶ τὸ ἁγιαζόμενον βρῶμα διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ καὶ ἐντεύξεως, κατ' αὐτὸ μὲν τὸ ὑλικὸν εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν χωρεῖ καὶ εἰς ἀφεδρώνα ἐκβάλλεται.]

cup, but also after he had ministered the communion: "I will drink no more of this fruit of the vine?" It is well known, that the fruit of the vine is wine, and not blood.

M. HARDING.

What is that we call holy and heavenly mysteries. In this sacrament, after consecration, the substance of bread and wine being turned into the substance of the body and blood of Christ, the ^a outward forms of bread and wine, which remain, are the sacraments of holy things, the body and blood of Christ⁴⁷.....

^a Untruth. No doctor or father ever taught such vain follies.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

In every natural thing two things are specially to be considered: the *substance* and the *accident*, or, as M. Harding calleth it, the *outward form*. For example: In bread the material thing that feedeth us, and is changed into the blood and nourishment of our bodies, is called the *substance* of the bread: the whiteness, the roundness, the thickness, the sweetness, and other the like, that are perceived outwardly by our senses, are called *accidents*. Now, saith M. Harding, forasmuch as the *substance* of the bread and wine is removed by consecration, and for that cause cannot be the sacrament: therefore the *accidents* and *forms* which remain must needs be thought to be the sacraments. And so upon a false position, as shall appear, he layeth the foundation of all his doctrine, by the old rule, I trow, that he learned sometimes in his *sophistry*: *Ex impossibili sequitur quodlibet*: "Of an impossibility ye may conclude what ye list." Even as aptly and as truly as some have said: If Christ were not Christ, then St. Patrick should be Christ.

If M. Harding had alleged either scripture, or doctor, or father, or council, or any other authority, beside his own, he might haply have been believed.

To this whole fancy, gentle reader, in my former Reply [Reply, art. 25. vol. iii. p. 470.] I have made a several answer. Verily Christ saith: *Non*

⁴⁷ [Jewel has divided Harding's answer to this division into several portions, as below: and, in pursuance of his declared intention, he has occasionally omitted or

abridged some of Harding's "superfluous talk." Whenever any thing worth noting occurs in the part omitted, the Editor will, as usual, supply what is wanting.]

Matt. xxvi. 29. *bibam ex hoc fructu vitis* : "I will no more drink" (not of these *accidents*, but) "of this generation, and fruit" (and *substance*) "of the vine."

1 Cor. x. 16. St. Paul saith : *Panis quem frangimus* : (not the *forms* or *accidents*, but) "the bread that we break." And again :

1 Cor. xi. 26. *Quoties manducabitis panem hunc* : "As often as ye shall eat" (not these *accidents*, but) "*this bread*."

Cyprian, [ad Magnum. p. 153.] St. Cyprian saith of the same : *Panis ex multorum granorum adunatione congestus* : "Bread moulded, and made of many corns." I doubt not but M. Harding will confess, that corns yield flour and *substance* : and not only *forms* and *accidents*. St. Augustine calleth the holy mystery,

Augustin. [I. Fulgent.] de Fide, ad Patr. cap. 19. [vi. app. 30.] *Sacramentum panis et vini* : "The sacrament" (not of *forms* and *accidents*, as M. Harding saith, but) "of bread and wine"⁴⁸. Cyrillus saith : *Credientibus discipulis fragmenta panis dedit* : "Christ gave unto his disciples believing in him, *pieces of bread*"⁴⁹, (not pieces of *accidents*.)

But M. Harding, having in his phantasy removed the whole *substance* of the bread, instead thereof hath brought us in *holy forms*, *holy shows*, and *holy accidents*. His *accidents* be the mysteries of heavenly things : his *accidents* be the instruments of God's grace : his *accidents* be the causes of remission of sin. We break *accidents* : we eat *accidents* : we drink *accidents* : we are fed with *accidents* : the *substance* of our bodies is increased with *accidents* : and, to be short, he worketh all his miracles by the power of his *accidents*.

M. HARDING.

a Untruth : for this phrase is used commonly of the ancient fathers, as shall appear. Why be ye loth to speak as the church speaketh, that in this blessed sacrament we receive the body of Christ? why had ye rather say after a strange manner, that by bread and wine Christ himself is so presently given unto us, as that by faith we verily receive his body and his blood?.....

The defenders refuse to speak as the church speaketh.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

I never thought it had been so great an heresy to speak as the apostles of Christ and the learned doctors of the church have spoken before us. St. Paul saith : *Consepulti*

Rom. vi. 4.
Coloss. ii. 12,

⁴⁸ [Supra vol. ii. 404, note ⁹⁰.]

⁴⁹ [Cyrill. in Johan. Vid. supra vol. i. p. 242, note ⁷⁶.]

sumus cum Christo per baptismum in mortem : “We are buried together with Christ *by* baptism unto death.”

St. Hierom saith : *Per aquam baptismi, vel per ignem Spiritus Sancti, ceteri illius panis corpus efficitur* : “*By* the water of baptism, or *by* the fire of the Holy Ghost, he is made the body of the everlasting bread⁵⁰.” St. Augustine saith : *Habes Christum in presenti, per fidem : in presenti, per baptismatis sacramentum : in presenti, per altaris cibum et potum* : “Thou hast Christ in presence, *by* faith : in presence, *by* the sacrament of baptism : in presence, *by* the meat and drink of the altar.” St. Cyril saith : *Corporaliter filius per benedictionem mysticam nobis unitur, ut homo* : “The Son of God *by* the mystical blessing is united unto us as man.” St. Hilary saith : *Christus est in nobis per sacramentorum mysterium* : “Christ is in us *by* the mystery of the sacraments.”

And, lest M. Harding should think to take any great advantage by these words thus uttered, as he and others of his side have often done, St. Augustine in most plain wise expoundeth the same : *Si ad ipsas res visibiles, quibus sacramenta tractantur, animum conferamus, quis nesciat eas esse corruptibiles ? si autem ad id quod per illas (res) agitur, quis non videat, non posse corrumpi ?* “If we behold the visible creatures,” (as the bread, the wine, the water,) “wherein the sacraments are ministered, who seeth not, that they be *corruptible* ? but if we consider the things that are wrought thereby, who seeth not, that they *cannot be corrupted* ?”

Now judge thou, good Christian reader, how childishly these quarrels be sought against us without cause : and what mystical catholic ears M. Harding hath, that cannot abide the phrases and speeches of the ancient fathers.

M. HARDING.

What presence of Christ in the sacrament do the defenders acknowledge. If a man should press you with your own words, and demand what manner of presence ye teach, affirming Christ himself presently to be given : I ween, ye would be found halting. For how say ye ? If Christ be presently given unto us by bread and

⁵⁰ [Hieron. de Corp. et Sanguin. Christi. The Bened. pronounce this treatise to be “*incerti auctoris*.”]

wine in the sacrament, then is Christ present. If he be present, which ye must needs grant, tell us further, how is he present : according to the substance of his body, or by grace, or according to the majesty of his Godhead ? The first, what shifts soever ye seek, ye will not grant. And therefore is your own apostle Martin Luther at foul defiance with your masters, Zwinglius, Œcolampadius, Calvin, and you, and so be his disciples, Joachimus Westphalus, Epinus, Pomeran, Heshusius, Brentius, Illyricus, and many others, as ye know. If ye will say he is present by his grace, so is he present with all good men : and that not only when the sacrament is ministered, but also at all other times..... Again, how can ye make good, that by faith we receive his body and blood ? By faith we receive grace, and the merits of his death suffered in his body with shedding of his blood. But the body and blood itself, that is, the very ^a substance of his body and blood : tell us how by faith ^a properly and truly to speak, as who should say, by faith made present, we receive it. Furthermore, ^b what have ye to answer to this question ? If we receive the body and blood of Christ verily by faith, (for so ye say,) we demand, whether we receive the same by faith only without the body, or with the office of our body ? If the office of our body be required to the receiving of Christ's body in the sacrament, as Christ himself ^c certainly meant (for else how obeyed the disciples his commandment, to whom he said at his supper, "Take and eat, this is my body : " likewise of the cup, "Take and drink," which cannot be done but by the service of the body ?) hereof then it followeth, that his body is verily present..... Now, that it is not received by faith only, thus we prove it by your own doctrine : ^d It is so received, as it is present : but it is present by bread and wine (as ye say) : *ergo*, it is received by bread and wine. To conclude, if by bread and wine, then not by faith only. Will ye give me leave to say what I think of you ? Verily it seemeth by your vain jangling, that, as St. Paul saith of such other like you, ye understand not what ye speak nor whereof ye affirm.

^a Untruths, two together. For properly and in substance we receive it not : read the answer.
^b We answer, It is a peevish question.

^c Untruth. For Christ meant no such thing, as appeareth by the fathers.

^d A sophistical and a childish cavil. Read the answer.

The body of Christ not received by faith only.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

In what sense we may truly say, "Christ is either present with us, or absent from us," the matter is not doubtful or dangerous to be answered, unless M. Harding have forgotten the Articles of his creed. For thus we are taught to believe : "Christ is ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God." Which Article St. Augustine expoundeth thus : *Noli dubitare, ibi nunc esse hominem Christum Jesum, unde venturus est : memoriterque recole, et fideliter tene Christianam confessionem, Quoniam resurrexit*

Augustin, epist. 57. ad Dardan. [il. 681.]

a mortuis: ascendit ad cælum: sedet ad dextram Patris: nec aliunde quam inde venturus est ad vivos mortuosque judicandos: "Doubt thou not, but Christ Jesus, as man, is there now, from whence he shall come: and bear thou well in mind, and faithfully believe the Christian confession, That Christ is risen again from the dead: and ascended into heaven: and sitteth at the right hand of the Father: and that he shall come again *from thence, and from no where else*, to judge the quick and the dead."

Again he saith: *Homo, secundum corpus, in cælo* [l. loco]⁵¹ *est: et de loco migrat: et cum ad alium locum venerit, in eo loco unde venit non est:* "Christ, as man, according to his body, is in heaven: and passeth from place to place: and when he cometh to another place, he is not in the other place from whence he came." Likewise again: *Secundum præsentiam Majestatis, semper habemus Christum (nobiscum): secundum præsentiam carnis, recte dictum est discipulis, Me autem non semper habebitis:* "According to the presence of his Majesty, we have Christ evermore with us: but according to the presence of the flesh, it is true that Christ said to his disciples, 'Me you shall not have always with you.'"

So saith the holy father and martyr ⁵²Vigilius: *Dei filius, secundum humanitatem suam, recessit a nobis: secundum divinitatem ait, Ecce, ego vobiscum sum usque ad consummationem sæculi:* "The Son of God, according to his manhood, is gone from us: but according to his Godhead he saith, 'Behold, I am with you until the end of the world.'" And again: *Et nobiscum est, et non est nobiscum: quia quos reliquit humanitate, non deseruit Divinitate:* "Christ is with us, and yet he is not with us: for whom he left touching his human nature, or his body, touching his Godhead he left them not." And again: *Verbum..... ubique est: (caro autem ejus ubique non est)*⁵³: "The Word (or Godhead of Christ) is every where: but his flesh, or

⁵¹ [Augustin. in Johan. Jewel has made a remarkable mistake here in reading "cælo" instead of "loco."]

⁵² [Supra vol. ii. p. 415, note 8.]

⁵³ [The last clause in this sentence is implied in the words of Vigilius.]

Cyrril. in Joh. lib. 10. cap. 7. [iv. 839.] *body, is not every where.*" So saith St. Cyril: *Etsi corpore abfuero, præsens tamen ero ut Deus* : " Although I be *absent* as touching my body, yet as God I will be present⁵⁴."

And, to leave an infinite number of other learned and catholic fathers that have written the like, Origen saith thus: *Secundum Divinitatis naturam non peregrinatur a nobis: peregrinatur secundum dispensationem corporis quod suscepit* : " Christ, according to his *Godhead*, is not a stranger to us: but he is a stranger according to the *dispensation of the body* that he received."

Thus is Christ both *absent* and *present*: *present* in majesty, *absent* in body. And in this sense Chrysostom saith: *Semper nobiscum est Christus: neque enim, nisi nobiscum esset Christus, superesset ecclesia* : " Christ is evermore *present* with us: for unless he were *present*, the church of God could not continue."

But M. Harding saith: " How can ye make good, that by faith we receive his body and blood? By faith we receive grace?" &c. This question should rather have been demanded of St. Augustine, and of other learned doctors and ancient fathers of the church. How could St. Augustine say: *Quid paras dentem et ventrem? Crede, et manducasti* : " What preparest thou thy tooth and thy belly? *Believe, and thou hast eaten.*" How could Tertullian say:

Christus auditu devorandus (est): ruminandus intellectu (est): et fide digerendus (est)? " Christ must be devoured by hearing: chewed by understanding: digested by faith?"

How could Origen say: *Sanguis testamenti infusus est in corda nostra?* " The blood of the testament is poured into our hearts?" How could St. Cyprian say: *Esus hujus carnis est quedam aviditas, et quoddam desiderium manducandi in Christo* :—" quod est esca carni, hoc est animæ fides :—" non dentes ad mordendum acuiimus, sed fide sincera panem sanctum frangimus?" " The eating of this flesh is a certain greediness, and a certain desire to tarry in Christ: that meat is unto our flesh, the same is faith unto our souls: we sharpen not our teeth to bite withal: but

⁵⁴ [Cyrril. συνέσμαι γὰρ πάλιν ὑμῖν, καὶ ἀπὼν τῷ σώματι, ἀνατειχῶ πάλιν τὰς εὐμενείας, ὡς Θεός.]

with pure faith we break this holy bread." To be short, how could St. Augustine say, *Credere in Christum, hoc est manducare panem vivum?* "To believe in Christ, that is the eating of the bread of life." And again: *Nolite parare fauces sed cor:* "Prepare not your mouths" (to eat of this bread), "but prepare your hearts." To these and other like ancient catholic fathers M. Harding should have said, "How can ye make good, that by *faith* we receive Christ's body and blood?" Thus they witness: thus they write: thus they say: and therefore, unless M. Harding can find untruth in their words, they *make it good*.

But to force onward his matter he saith: "Properly and truly to speak, how can we eat Christ's body by faith?" Here it might have pleased M. Harding to remember, that these phrases, "to eat Christ:" "to drink Christ:" "to digest Christ:" "to be fed with Christ:" "to dwell in Christ:" "to be clad with Christ:" "to be graft in Christ:" and other the like, are not plain, ordinary, usual, and common speeches, but mystically and covertly uttered under a figure: thereby to give us to understand, that Christ is our spiritual meat, our spiritual drink, our spiritual sustenance, our spiritual house, our spiritual robe, and our spiritual stock. Therefore St. Augustine saith: *Nisi manducaveritis carnem Filii hominis, et sanguinem biberitis, non habebitis vitam in vobis. Facinus, vel flagitium videtur jubere. Figura ergo est, præcipiens passioni Domini* [al. *passioni Dominicæ*] *esse communicandum, et suaviter atque utiliter recondendum in memoria, quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa, et vulnerata sit:* "Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye shall have no life in you." He seemeth by these words to command us to do an horrible wickedness." (For it is an horrible matter to eat man's flesh, or to drink man's blood.) "Therefore this is a figure," (or manner of speech,) "commanding us to be partakers of Christ's passion, and comfortably to lay up in our mind, that his flesh was crucified and wounded for our sakes." So saith Gratian, touching the same: *Quidam non improbabili-ter exponunt, carnis et sanguinis veritatem, ipsam earundem rerum efficientiam, id est, remis-*

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
26. [iii. pt. 2.
494.]

Augustin. de
Doctrina
Christian.
lib. 3. cap. 16.
[iii. 52.]

De Con. dist.
2. Species.

sionem peccatorum: “Touching these words, the *truth* of Christ’s flesh and blood, some men not unaptly understand thereby *the effect and force of Christ’s flesh and blood*, that is to say, the remission of our sins.” And so St. Augustine

Augustin. in
Apoc. hom.
6. [iii. app.
166.]

saith: *Laverunt stolas suas in sanguine agni, hoc est, in gratia Dei per Christum*: “‘They washed their coats in the blood of the Lamb,’ that is to say, in the *grace of God through Christ*⁵⁵.” This grace, flowing from Christ’s body upon the cross, and given to the faithful in the ministration of the holy mysteries, oftentimes beareth the name of Christ’s body, and is the ground and substance of the sacrament: and whosoever is partaker of this grace is also partaker of Christ’s body. Therefore St. Augustine saith:

Augustin. in
Psalm. lxxvii.
[iv. 816.]

Cum essent omnibus communia sacramenta, non communis erat omnibus gratia, quæ est virtus sacramentorum: “Whereas the sacraments were common to all, yet the *grace* thereof was not common to all.” And that is the power and strength of the sacraments.

Ambros. de
Sacram. lib.
6. i. cap. 1.
[iv. 380.]

Likewise St. Ambrose: *In similitudinem quidem accipis sacramentum: sed veræ naturæ gratiam, virtutemque consequeris*: “Ye take the sacrament in representation or remembrance: but ye obtain thereby the *grace and power of Christ’s very nature*⁵⁶.”

Here M. Harding once again moveth a very needless question. “We demand,” saith he, “whether we receive the same body of Christ by faith only, without our body, or with the office of our body.” Any child might soon be

Raban Maurus,
[de Inst.
Cler.] cap. 31.
[tom. vi. p.
11.]

able to assoil this riddle. Rabanus Maurus saith, as it is alleged before, *Sacramentum ore percipitur: virtute vero sacramenti interior homo satiatur*: “The sacrament is received with the *bodily* mouth: but *with the virtue* of the sacrament” (which is the body of Christ) “*the inner man*” (that is, not the body, but the soul) “is filled.” So saith

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
27. [iii. pt. 2.
502.]

Augustine: *Cum videbitis Filium hominis ascendentem, ubi erat prius, certe vel tunc videbitis, quia non eo modo, quo putatis, erogat corpus suum: certe vel tunc intelligetis, quia gratia ejus non consumitur morsibus*: “When ye shall see

⁵⁵ [The Commentary on the Apocalypse is not St. Augustine’s.]

⁵⁶ [Supra i. 188, note ³⁰.]

the Son of man ascending thither, where he was before, then at the least ye shall see, that he giveth not his *body in such sort as you imagine*: then shall you understand, that his *grace is not consumed with the bit of mouth*." Again he saith: *Qui manducat intus, non foris: qui manducat in corde, non qui premit dente*: "He that eateth Christ's body Augustin, in Johan. tract. 26. [iii. pt. 2. 499.] inwardly, not that eateth" (the sacrament) "*outwardly*: he that eateth the body of Christ itself *in his heart*, not that presseth" (the sacrament) "*with his tooth*."

M. Harding argueth further, "Christ's body is so received, as it is present: but it is present by bread and wine, (ye say,) *ergo*, it is received by bread and wine: to conclude, if by bread and wine, then not by faith only." If M. Harding had better considered the rules of his old sophistry, he might soon have seen the wants and deformities of this reason. Amongst children it is called *ignoratio elenchi*: which is the simplest *fallax* of all the rest:

It is true, that of our part, it is not either our *hand*, or our *mouth*, but *faith only*, that receiveth the body of Christ: but the same body of Christ is offered and represented unto our faith by mean of the sacraments. We speak of such instruments of receiving, as are of ourself, and be within us: M. Harding answereth of the sacraments, that be external instruments, and are wholly without us. So in *baptism*, notwithstanding we have Christ present of our part *only by faith*, yet St. Augustine saith, as it is said before, *Habemus Christum in præsenti per baptismatis sacramentum*: "We have Christ presently by the sacrament of baptism." Thus is Christ present unto us: of his part, *only by his grace*: of our part, *only by our faith*: by the sacraments, *only*, as by mean of outward instruments, to move our senses. This light and childish error, I have said before, is called *ignoratio elenchi*, and therefore seemeth to proceed of ignorance. M. Harding should have better examined the force of his arguments, before he thus suddenly sent them abroad.

Touching the matter itself, it is not the bodily mouth, but *faith alone*, that receiveth and embraceth Christ's body. St. Augustine saith: *Panis iste interioris hominis quærit* Augustin, in Johan. tract. 26. [iii. pt. 2. 494.]

esuriem. Qui credit in eum, manducat: "This bread requireth the hunger of the inner man. He that *believeth* in him, eateth his body."

This is no jangling, as you say, M. Harding: it is the ancient catholic doctrine of the church of God. We be well assured of it, and know certainly what we say. But touching the certainty of your doctrine in this point, I have briefly touched it in my former Reply, so much as I then thought might seem sufficient. Some of you hold, "that Christ's body passeth down into the stomach:" some say, "that it entereth only into the mouth, and goeth no further:" some other say, *Quam cito species teruntur dentibus, tam cito in cælum rapitur corpus Christi*: "As soon as the forms of the bread be grated with the teeth, straightway the body of Christ *is caught up* into heaven." Another of you saith: "A *mouse* eateth the body of Christ." Another saith: "Nay, a *mouse* cannot eat it." Peter Lombard, the grand master of all your school, is piteously confounded in the case, and cannot imagine, poor man, what thing it should be, that the mouse eateth. For, after he had himself moved the question, *Quid igitur sumit mus, vel quid manducat?* "What is it then that the *mouse* receiveth, or what eateth it?" he answereth, *Deus novit*: "Now, God knoweth:" (as for my part I cannot tell.)

Such be your *doctors*, M. Harding: such is your *doctrine*. Therefore to conclude with your own words, "It appeareth by your agreement and your answers ye understand not the things ye speak of, but both affirm and deny ye know not what."

M. HARDING.

As ye proceed forth, ye give warning to your readers not to take you so, as though ye held with transubstantiation. And here ye speak thereof as best becometh your scoffing spirit, calling it a dream of men of later times, whereof they could never yet agree within themselves. By which words your eloquence hath set forth your spite and lying at once. For albeit the term of transubstantiation be ^a of no greater antiquity than the council of Lateran under Innocentius the Third, where it was by the Holy Ghost and the fathers there devised, as very fit for opening of the truth impugned by the Berengarians: yet is the doctrine

[Reply, art. 23. vol. i. 461.]

De Con. dist. 2. Tribus Grad. In Glossa.

4 Sentent. dist. 13.

a Mark this antiquity. This council was holden twelve hundred and fifteen years after Christ.

Transubstantiation

thereof no less ancient than the gospel itself. For maugre the malice of the devil, and of all the sacramentaries, the old truth shall prevail, by which we are taught, that which was bread, by the mystical blessing to be ^b made Christ's body; and that which was wine to be made his blood, as I have otherwheres sufficiently declared. And the church hath ^c always hereupon perfectly accorded, touching the substance; though certain schoolmen in their scholastical disputations, where oftentimes victory is sought, and faith not impugned, about discussion of some school point, have, without prejudice of our belief, disagreed.....

^b As in a mystery, or sacrament, but not in substance. Otherwise it is a great untruth.

^c Untruth manifest, as shall appear.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

As for the *scoffs*, and *spites*, and *lies* ye speak of, M. Harding, let him have them, that hath best deserved them. Then verily, without great wrong, you cannot lose them.

Touching your new phantasy of *transubstantiation*, "whether it be a dream or no, and whether the dreamers of it themselves were ever yet able rightly to expound their own dream," it appeareth partly by your own confession. Ye grant, "the name and term thereof was never known or heard of all the world, until your late council of Lateran," holden in Rome under pope Innocentius the Third, in the year of our Lord 1215, in the time of king ^{Anno 1215.} John, the king of England, and never before. Then did your strange doctrine and new divinity, touching this article, first begin. So long the church of God was able well to stand without your *transubstantiation*.

And albeit ye tell us, "Notwithstanding the newness of the name, yet nevertheless the doctrine thereof hath still continued in the church, and hath been evermore received and confessed of all the faithful; and that, maugre the malice of the devil, and all the sacramentaries, it is as ancient as the gospel, or as Christ himself:" yet of the other side ye confess plainly, that for the space of twelve hundred years and more no man wist by what name to call it.

But forasmuch as you think it lawful for you to avouch and affirm what you list, true or false, without controlment: whereas ye say, "This late faith of yours is as ancient as the gospel;" know you, that some of the best learned of your own side have said, "It is a new point in

Cuthbertus
Tonstallus,
de Eucharis-
tia, lib. 1. p.
46. [b.]

religion;" and therefore not so ancient as you seem to make it: some others say, "It is a doubtful conclusion;" and therefore no faith at all. D. Tonstall thereof saith thus: *De modo, quo id fieret, fortasse satius erat, curiosum quæque suæ relinquere conjecturæ: sicut liberum fuit ante concilium Lateranum*: "Of the manner and mean how this might be," (whether by *transubstantiation* or otherwise,) "perhaps it had been better to leave every man that would be curious, to his own conjecture: as before the council of Lateran it was left at liberty." You say, "It is as ancient as the gospel." D. Tonstall saith, "It is but new, and came in twelve hundred years and more after the gospel." You say, "It is the catholic faith." D. Tonstall saith, "It is a conjecture or a guess," (which differeth not much from a *dream*,) "and that before the said late council of Lateran no man *was bound to believe it*." And here it may please you to consider indifferently with yourself: "If it were left at liberty," as D. Tonstall saith, for any man either to receive it or to refuse it, as he thought good, how could it then be the *catholic faith*? If it were the *catholic faith*, as you say, "and that maugre the malice of the devil," how then could it so many hundred years be left at liberty?

Hereof ye say, "Ye have written sufficiently otherwheres." All this I grant: your books are known. Howbeit, if you would have written no more but truth, ye might have saved much time, and spared some paper. But if it shall not mislike you once again more advisedly to view the same, ye shall find in the very first division thereof three great untruths together, all within the space of fourteen lines.

Sent. 4. dist.
11. Si autem,
&c.

Now whether your phantasy of *transubstantiation* be a *dream* or no, by the constancy and certainty thereof, and by the agreement of your doctors that founded it first, it may appear. Petrus Lombardus, the only general of all this camp, hereof useth these speeches: *Quibusdam ita videtur: quidam dicunt: quidam tradunt: quidam concedunt: alii putaverunt, substantiam ibi panis et vini remanere*: "Some men *judge* thus: some *say* thus: some have

written thus: some *grant* this: some others have *thought* thus: that the very *substance of the bread and wine remaineth still.*" Here is a strange agreement of learned men, specially in a case of the *catholic faith*. But hereto what saith Peter Lombard himself, that taketh upon him, as a judge, to determine these doubts? How is he resolved? or, how agreeth he in judgment with himself? His answer is this: *Si autem quæritur, qualis sit illa conversio, an formalis, an substantialis, an alterius generis, definire non sufficio*: "If a question were moved, what manner of conversion or change this is: whether it be in *form* or in *substance*, or of some other sort, *I am not able to discuss it.*"

Here we may see, the blind leadeth the blind. He that setteth himself before all the rest, and would be taken for a guide, knoweth not where to set his own foot. Gabriel

Biel saith: *Quomodo sit ibi corpus Christi, utrum per conversionem alicujus in ipsum, an sine conversione incipiat esse corpus Christi cum pane, manentibus substantia, et accidentibus panis, non invenitur expressum in canone Biblicæ*: Gabriel, in Canon. lect. 40. [sub. init.]

"How the body of Christ is there, whether it be by changing of some thing into it, or Christ's body begin to be there together with the bread, both *the substance and the accidents of the bread remaining still without changing*, it is not found expressed in the canon of the Bible." I leave Innocentius, Scotus, and sundry others of your *scholastical doctors*, with their doubtful *dreams* and guesses, to like purpose.

Whether these be *dreams* or no, I leave to you, M. Harding, to consider. Verily, Innocentius III. saith: *Fuerunt, qui dicerent, quod, sicut post consecrationem vera panis remanent accidentia, ita panis remanet vera substantia*:

"There were some that said, that, as after consecration there remain the very accidents or forms of bread, so likewise the *very substance of the same bread remaineth still.*"

And cardinal Cusanus saith: *Quidam veteres theologi intellexisse reperiuntur, panem non transubstantiari, sed supervestiri nobiliori substantia*: Nicol. Cusanus Excitationum, lib. 6. [p. 522.] "Certain of the ancient divines are found of this mind, that the bread in the sacrament is not *transubstantiated*, or changed in nature, but remaineth

still, and is clothed with another substance more noble than itself." This was the judgment of sundry the fathers best learned in divinity : and this same judgment Durandus, although he himself hold it not, yet he will not have it in any wise to be condemned.

Now, M. Harding, if you dissemble not, but believe constantly, as you say, then cannot these things stand without prejudice of your belief. For *faith* built upon uncertainty is no *faith* at all.

M. HARDING.

But Lord, what meant ye to allege Theophylact and St. Ambrose, whose doctrine is so contrary to yours, as light is to darkness? Theophylact, expounding these words of Christ in St. John, "As the living Father hath sent me, even so live I by the Father; and he that eateth me shall live by me," saith thus: "Doeſt thou not hear a dreadful saying? We eat not pure God, for he is untouchable and unbodily. Neither can he be comprehended with eyes nor teeth. Neither eat we the flesh of a pure man; for that can profit nothing at all. But now that God hath united unto himself flesh after an unspeakable contemperament, the flesh is also become life-making. Not for that it passed away into the nature of God; beware of that; but after the likeness of fiery iron, which abideth iron, and sheweth the operation of fire: even so," quoth he, "the flesh of our Lord abiding flesh, is life-making, as being the flesh of God the Word. Then as (saith he) I live by the Father, who is life, so he that eateth me shall live by me, being tempered with me, as also being transelemented into me, who have power to vivificate or give life." Which last words your own doctor Ecolampadius hath thus turned: *Dum quodammodo miscetur, et transelementatur in me, qui vivificare potest*, corrupting the sound doctrine of the writer with his forged ^a*quodammodo*, which he found not in the Greek there placed, and breaking the congruity of the Latin speech, by putting that in the third person that ought to be in the first. If faith wrought all this matter, then after your meaning might we eat God, which Theophylact denieth. He saith, "He that eateth Christ's flesh is tempered together with him, and transelemented into him, so as he is made one body with him," as Cyrillus expoundeth the place of St. Paul to the Ephesians, where he saith, that we be *concorporales*, that is Eph. iii. to say, of one body with Christ. And anotherwhere, "flesh of Ephes. his flesh, and bone of his bones."

This similitude of fiery iron quite overthroweth the whole phantasy of transubstantiation.

^a Untruth, presumed only of ignorance. For *quodammodo* is in the text, Ἀνακρινώμενος ὥσπερ, καὶ μεταστοιχείουμένους.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Of Theophylact's authority, we never made any great account. He is but a very late writer, in comparison of

the ancient fathers. For the most part of that he writeth, he is but an abridger of Chrysostom. He writeth against the church of Rome, stoutly maintaining a known heresy, concerning the *proceeding of the Holy Ghost*. Notwithstanding, in this place we alleged his words to good purpose. For, as he saith, “we are transelemented or trans-natured and changed into Christ,” even so, and none otherwise, we say, the bread is *transelemented* or changed into Christ’s body. But notwithstanding this change, we remain still in substance as we were before: therefore we say, notwithstanding the like change, the *substance* of the bread in like manner remaineth still.

But what fancy came in your head, M. Harding, thus to allege, and so vehemently to force this place of Theophylact? What one word speaketh he either of your *transubstantiation*, or of your *real presence*, or of your *corporal* and *fleshly eating*? Verily, as by any his express words he nothing aideth you, so by his example of *fiery iron* he seemeth quite to overthrow you. For if ye compare the *sacrament* with a piece of *burning iron*, (which nevertheless was not Theophylact’s meaning; and therefore ye are therein much deceived,) then, as the iron, although it be fiery, yet notwithstanding in *nature* and *substance* is iron still; even so the *bread*, although it be made the *sacrament* of Christ’s body, and so the instrument of the grace of God, yet, that notwithstanding, in *nature* and *substance* is *bread still*.

Here, lest you, giving over your *transubstantiation*, as knowing it to be only a late found phantasy, should hope nevertheless by this example of *fiery iron* to establish your *real presence*, and to say, that, *as the fire is really and indeed in the iron*, so the body of Christ is indeed and *really* in the sacrament; it may please you to call to mind, that in the holy learned fathers the same example and like form of speech is used also of the *sacrament of baptism*. In the *council of Nice* it is written thus: *Vides aquam: cogita de virtute Dei, quæ latet in aqua. Cogita, aquam esse plenam ignis divini*: “Thou seest the water: think thou of the power of God that *lieth in the water*: think thou, that the

Concil. Nicen., [ii. 888.]
πλήρη τοῦ
θείου πυρὸς
νόει τὰ ὕ-
δατα.

water is full of heavenly fire⁵⁶. Yet I trow ye will not have us believe, as an article of our faith, *that this fire*, whereby is meant the blood of Christ, is indeed and really in the water.

These, and such other the like, may not always be taken as phrases of precise truth, but rather as amplifications, or heats of speech, the better to stir up and to inflame the minds of the hearers. And in this sort and sense, to leave other authorities, Hosius, your own doctor, saith: *Opera nostra respersa sunt sanguine Christi*: "Our works be sprinkled with the blood of Christ." So saith pope Innocentius III: *Virtutes nostræ crucis Christi sanguine purpurantur*: "Our virtues are dyed as red as purple in the blood of the cross of Christ⁵⁷."

Thus only, M. Harding, and none otherwise, the holy fathers say, "The bread of the holy mysteries and the water of baptism are full of fire."

Further, Theophylact saith: "The body of Christ is eaten: but the *godhead is not eaten*; because it is untouchable and uncomprehensible unto our senses." Hereof you would seem to reason thus: "If faith wrought all this matter, then might we eat God. For by faith we believe in God."

First, touching the *eating of God*, God himself saith, *Gustate et videte, quod suavis est Dominus*: "Taste and see that the Lord is delectable." St. Augustine saith: *Panis est, et panis est, et panis est: Deus Pater, Deus Filius, et Deus Spiritus Sanctus*: "It is bread, it is bread, and it is bread: God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost." Again he saith: *Deus panis* [suppl. *oris*] *intus est animæ meæ*: "God is the inward bread of my soul." Therefore it is not so thoroughly and undoubtedly true that you say, "The nature of God cannot be eaten."

Notwithstanding, for sparing of words and time herein, I will refer you to my former Reply. There shall you find this whole objection fully answered.

You say, Theophylact's reason standeth thus: "God

Hosius in
Conf. Petri-
covien. cap.
48. [fol. 50.
col. 1.]

Innocen. de
Mysteriis
Miss. lib. 2.

Psal. xxxiv. 8.
1 Pet. ii. 3.
Augustin. de
Verb. Domin.
secund. Luc.
serm. 29. [v.
542.]

Augustin.
Conf. lib. 1.
[cap. 13. l.
77.]

Art. 8. div. 16.
[sup. vol. iii.
p. 26.]

⁵⁶ [Supra vol. ii. p. 358, note ⁵³.]

⁵⁷ [There is some mistake in the reference.]

cannot be eaten, because he cannot be comprehended, either with eyes or with teeth. But Christ's body may be eaten. Therefore it must follow in the conclusion, that with our eyes we may see it, and with our teeth we may receive it." Here would I fain learn of you, M. Harding, *When ye saw Christ's body* visibly in the sacrament with your eyes, or when ye *pressed it with your teeth*? If your *teeth* can receive it, why saith St. Augustine: *Quid paras dentem et ventrem?* "Why preparest thou thy *tooth* and thy belly?" If your *bodily eye* can see it, why say you it is *invisible*? If it be *invisible*, how is it seen? If it be seen, how is it *invisible*? It appeareth, that either Theophylact the master or you the scholar are deceived, or one of you understandeth not the other's meaning. Certainly, as Christ's *body is seen* in the sacrament, so is it eaten in the sacrament. But it is not really or fleshly seen: therefore it is not really or fleshly eaten.

To avoid error herein, it behoveth us to understand, that *to eat God* is to have the fruition of the *divine nature*, and to be incorporate into God. But the majesty of God so far surmounteth the capacity of man, that, as he is in himself in *nature* and *Godhead*, no mortal creature is able to conceive him but only in the face and sight of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. Therefore St. Paul saith: *Christus est splendor gloriæ, et character substantiæ Dei*: "Christ is the brightness of the glory and the express image of the substance of God." St. Augustine saith: *Tu quomodo contingis Deum? Quia Verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis*: "How doest thou touch God?" (He answereth) "Because the Word became flesh and dwelt in us." Again he saith: *Si Christus sic veniret, ut Deus, non agnosceretur*: "If Christ came so, *as he is God*, no man could know him." St. Gregory saith: *Dominus murus nobis non esset, si forinsecus non fuisset: intus nos non protegeret, si exterius non appareret*: "Our Lord were no wall unto us, if he had not been in the *form of man*: he could not inwardly defend us, if he had not *outwardly* appeared." So saith Dionysius: *Si cupinus communionem habere cum Deo, oportet nos in divinissimam illius vitam, quam egit in*

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
25. [iii. pt. 2.
489.]

Heb. i. 3.

Augustin. in
Psal. cxxxiv.
[iv. 1495.]

Augustin. in
Joh. tract. 2.
[iii. p. 299.]

Gregor. in
Ezec. lib. 1.
hom. 14. [al.
lib. 2. hom. 2.
tom. i. 1322.]

Eccles. Hier.
cap. 3. [p.
157.]

carne, intueri: "If we desire to have communion with God, we must behold that heavenly life *that he led in the flesh*." Thus, as God is God in majesty and in himself, we *understand* him not, we *conceive* him not, we *know* him not: that is to say, we have *no fruition* of him, *we eat him not*. Therefore St. Augustine saith: *Jesum Christum secundum id, quod erat Verbum apud Deum, parvuli non capiunt. Quomodo ergo capiunt, qui lac capiunt? Jesum Christum, inquit, et hunc crucifixum. Suge, quod pro te factus est: et cresces ad id, quod est*: "Little ones understand not Jesus Christ, according to that he was the Word with the Father. How then do they receive him, that receive milk? St. Paul saith, they receive Jesus Christ *crucified*. *Suck that thing that he was made for thee*: and thou shalt grow to that he is."

Augustin. in
Psalm. cxix.
[iv. 1366.]

Thus in the holy mysteries there is presented unto us, not the divine nature of Christ, whereby he is equal to the Father, but his death and humility, whereby he abased himself, and was made equal unto us. This is the spiritual meat and drink, and the only feeding of the soul. Thereof

1 Cor. xi. 26. St. Paul saith: "As often as ye shall eat of this bread and drink of this cup, ye shall publish" (not the *divine nature* or *Godhead*, but) "the Lord's death until he come." So

Hesych. in
Levit. lib. i.
cap. 2. [fol.
14. B.]

saith Hesychius: *Comedimus hunc* [al. *nunc*] *cibum, sumentes ejus memoriam passionis*: "We eat this food, receiving the *memory*" (not of his glory, but) "*of his pas-*

Ambros. in
1 Cor. xi. [ii.
149.]

sion." So saith St. Ambrose: *Quia morte Domini liberati sumus, hujus rei memores, in edendo et potando, carnem et sanguinem, quæ pro nobis oblata sunt, significamus*: "Because we are delivered by our Lord's death, being mindful thereof, in eating and drinking, we signify or represent the flesh and blood *that were offered up for us* ⁵⁷." Thus in the holy mysteries we eat and drink the sacrament of Christ crucified in the humility of his flesh. But his *divine nature in Godhead* and majesty cannot be represented or expressed by any sacraments.

It was all vain and lost labour for you, M. Harding, so

⁵⁷ [These Commentaries are not genuine. Supra vol. i. p. 159. note.]

earnestly to prove, *that Christ's body quickeneth and giveth life*. We know it: we confess it: we feel it. Christ himself saith it: "I am the bread of life: he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever." John vi. 51.

This talk impeacheth no man but yourself. For you tell us, and would have it holden as an article of your faith, not only "that the wicked man without faith, but also that the dumb creature void of reason may receive the very body of Christ, and that substantially, verily, and in deed." Thus you divide and sunder Christ's body from his spirit; and, contrary to Theophylact, and to all the ancient fathers, and to Christ himself, ye say, "it may be really received without life."

But we say with St. Ambrose: *Qui accipit hunc panem non moritur morte peccatoris: quia hic panis est remissio peccatorum*: "Whoso eateth this bread" (not the sacrament of Christ's body, but Christ's body itself) "*dieth not* the death of a sinner: for this bread is the remission of sins." We say with St. Augustine: *Qui carnem Domini non sumit, non habet vitam: et, qui eam sumit, habet vitam, et hanc utique æternam*: "He that receiveth not the flesh of our Lord *hath no life*; and he that receiveth it *hath life*, and the same everlasting." Again we say with St. Augustine: "*Hujus rei sacramentum de mensa Dominica sumitur, quibusdam ad vitam, quibusdam ad mortem* [leg. exitium]; *res vero ipsa, cujus sacramentum est, omni homini ad vitam, nulli ad exitium; quicumque ejus particeps fuerit*: "The sacrament" (of Christ's body) "is received from the Lord's table, to some unto life, to some unto death: *but the thing itself*" (that is, the body of Christ, whereof this is a sacrament) "*is to all men unto life, and to no man unto death, whosoever shall be partaker of it.*"

For some further declaration hereof, it appeareth by the witness of the ancient learned doctors and fathers, that we are really and corporally joined and united unto Christ, not only by the *mysteries of the holy supper*, but also by *faith*, by *baptism*, by the *Spirit of God*, by *love*, and other ways. Of *faith* St. Augustine saith thus: *Per fidem ad-* Augustin. epist. 31. [ii. 36.]

corporamur in Jesu Christo Domino nostro: "By faith we

are incorporate in Christ Jesu our Lord ⁵⁸." And again : *Qui venit ad me, incorporatur mihi* : " He that cometh unto me is incorporate into me." St. Chrysostom saith : *Quid nobis esse non vult, omnibus modis nos sibi conglutinandans, et conjungens ?* " What will not Christ be unto us ? For by all manner means he cleaveth and fasteneth himself unto us." Again in plainer sort he saith : *Dominum ipsum amplecteris, et commisceris, et (subrectus) conjungeris corpori illi, quod sursum sedet in cœlis* : " Thou embracest the Lord himself, and art mingled with him, and being here beneath, art joined to that body that sitteth in heaven above ⁵⁹."

In like manner he writeth of the sacrament of baptism : *Quomodo ex carne ejus sumus, et ex ossibus ejus ?..... Quemadmodum ille sine virili congressu natus est [al. factus est] ex Spiritu Sancto, ita nos illud efficimur [al. hoc fimus] in lavacro* : " How are we of his flesh and of his bones ?" He answereth : " As Christ was born by the Holy Ghost without the knowledge of man, even so in the font" (of baptism) " we are made the same," (that is, his flesh and his bones ⁶⁰.)

So saith Leo : *Sicut Dominus factus est caro nostra nascendo, ita nos facti sumus ipsius (caro) renascendo* : " As our Lord was made our flesh, by that he was born, so are we made his flesh, by that we are new born."

So saith St. Hierom : *De carne ejus sumus, et de ossibus ejus : ipse enim est caput corporis ecclesiæ* : " We are of his flesh and of his bones : for that he is the head of his body, which is the church ⁶¹."

Thus, M. Harding, we are joined together and tempered with Christ, not only by the *holy mysteries*, but also by the sacrament of baptism and by faith. And Chrysostom

⁵⁸ [The 31st Epistle is not by St. Augustine, but addressed to him by Paulinus and Therasia.]

⁵⁹ [Chrysost. ad Coloss. . . . ἄλλ' αὐτὸν εὐθέως περιλαμβάνεις τὸν δεσπότην, ἀνακεράννυσαι τῷ σώματι, ἀναφύρη τῷ σώματι τῷ ἄνω κειμένῳ. . . . There is nothing to answer to the word *subrectus*.]

⁶⁰ [Chrysost. in Eph. πῶς οὖν ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ ἐσμεν καὶ ἐκ

τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ ; . . . ὅπερ δηλοῦν βούλεται τοῦτό ἐστιν, ὅτι ὥσπερ ἄνευ συνουσίας ἐκεῖνος γεγέννηται ἐκ Πνεύματος ἁγίου, οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς γεννώμεθα ἐκ τῷ λουτρῷ. Bishop Jewel quotes from an incorrect Latin translation.]

⁶¹ [This work is assigned by the Ben. ed. to some eloquent and learned writer, but not to St. Jerome.]

Augustin, in Johan. tract. 25. [iii. pt. 2. 492.]

Chrysost. in Epist. ad Rom. hom. 24. [ix. 696.]

Chrysost. in Epist. ad Coloss. hom. 6. [xi. 370.]

Chrysost. in Epist. ad Ephes. hom. 20. [xi. 147. ed. Lat. 1588. tom. iv. 1004.]

Leo, de Nativitate Domini, serm. 3. [i. 152.]

Hieronym. de Viro Perfecto. [v. 61.]

saith: *Ne simpliciter teneamus Christum, sed etiam illi con-* Chrysost. in
1 Cor. hom.
8. [x. 70.]
glutinemur. Nam, si quicquam secesserimus ab eo, peri-
mus: “Let us not only hold Christ, but also let us be *fast*
glued unto him. For if we fall any thing from him, we
are utterly lost.” Must we therefore conclude, M. Hard-
ing, that the water of *baptism* is *transubstantiate*, no part
of the *substance* thereof remaining still? or, that Christ’s
body is really and grossly present in that sacrament, as you
have imagined of the other?

Ye find great fault with Æcolampadius, “for corrupt-
ing,” as ye say, “the sound doctrine of Theophylact with
his forged *quodammodo*, and for breaking the congruity of
the Latin speech, by putting the third person in place of
the first.” Of the Latin congruity I will say nothing. The
learned think that Æcolampadius was as skilful both in
the Latin tongue and in the Greek, as M. Harding. But
“for the forging of *quodammodo*,” why do you not as well
find fault with Theophylact himself? For if it be a forgery,
he himself hath likewise forged the same *quodammodo*:
and if that may be called *corruption*, he hath also corrupted
his own doctrine. These be his words: *Qui manducat me,* Theophyl. in
Johan. cap. 6.
ὁ δὲ τρώγων με
ζήσεται δι’
ἐμέ, ἀνακίρ-
νώμενος ὡς-
περ καὶ
μεταστοι-
χειούμενος
εἰς ἐμέ.
hic vivet propter me, dum quodammodo miscetur mihi, et
traselementatur in me: “He that eateth me shall live by
me: forasmuch as, *after a sort*, he is mingled with me, and
traselemented or *changed* into me.” If ye doubt whether
ὡςπερ in Greek may be expounded by *quodammodo*, then is
not your skill herein so great as ye have thought. Here
you see that not only Æcolampadius, but also Theophy-
lactus himself saith *quodammodo*.

Why find ye not fault with St. Augustine for saying the
like? *Omnes in illo, et Christi, et Christus sumus: quia* Augustin. in
Psalm. xxvi.
[Enar. 2.
tom. iv. 199.]
quodammodo totus Christus, et caput, et corpus est: “In
him we are all Christs and Christ himself: for *after a sort*
whole Christ is both the head” (of the church) “and also
the body.” And again: *Qui in Christum credit, credendo in* Augustin. in
Johan. serm.
61. [v. 694.]
Christum venit et [al. omitt. et] *in eum Christus, et quoquo* [al.
quodam] *modo unitur in eum, et membrum in corpore ejus*
efficitur: “He that believeth in Christ, by believing cometh
into Christ, and Christ into him, and *after a sort* is united
into him, and is made a member in his body.” And again:

Augustin.
epist. 120.
cap. 18. [al.
epist. 119.
cap. 17. ii.
141.]

Cyrrill. ad
Calosyrium.
[tom. vi.]

Chrysost. in
Matt. hom.
83. [vii. 788.
Lat. ed. 1588.
tom. ii. 570.]

Paulum Christus voce mactavit, et in suum corpus trajiciens, quodammodo manducavit: “Christ killed Paul with his voice, and after a sort did eat him, swallowing him down into his body.” Why find ye not the same fault with Cyrillus writing thus: *Decebat ergo eum quodammodo uniri corporibus nostris*: “It was meet that after a sort Christ should be united unto our bodies?⁶⁰” Or with St. Chrysostom, writing the like: *Christus nos secum in unam, ut ita dicam, massam reducit*: “Christ mouldeth us⁶¹, if I may so say, into one lump with himself?”

Why say ye not, these and other like holy fathers were sacramentaries and heretics? why say ye not, that St. Augustine, St. Cyril, St. Chrysostom, with their forged *quodammodo*, corrupted the sound and catholic doctrine of the church?”

Would ye rather, for the better facing and colouring of your doctrine, we should strike out this forged *quodammodo*, and amend it thus: *Qui manducat me, reipsa miscetur mihi, et transelementatur in me?* would ye have us to believe, that we are wholly and thoroughly changed into Christ's body, and that we are made very Christ, God and man, the same that was born of the virgin, and nailed to the cross: and that not *quodammodo*, “after a sort,” or by some peculiar phrase of speech, but substantially, really, verily, and indeed? I reckon your doctrine is not fully so fond.

Rom. xii. 5.

Cyrrill. in Jo-
han. lib. 11.
cap. 26. [iv.
999. C.]

Chrysost. in
1 Cor. hom.
18. [x. 155.]

St. Paul saith: *Sumus alter alterius membra*: “We are members one of another.” Cyrillus saith: *Nos inter nos unimur corporaliter*: “We are corporally united together among ourselves.” St. Chrysostom saith: *Si quis exuat impudicarum mulierum animas, videbit malum dæmonem illis admixtum*: “If any man will open the souls of unchaste or filthy women, he shall see the devil tempered together and mingled with them.” And think you, M. Harding, that these, and other like speeches of the holy fathers, cannot stand without your *transubstantiation*, and *real presence*? or, that the godly be substantially and indeed

⁶⁰ [The Editor has searched in vain for this passage.]

⁶¹ [Properly “we are moulded into one lump.” Supra vol. ii. 376, note 76.]

in their bodies joined together? or, that the ungodly be verily united and mingled with the devil, without any *quodammodo*?

You might rather have remembered, that touching this unspeakable unity between Christ and the faithful, that is to say, between the head and the body, St. Cyprian writeth thus: *Nostra et Christi conjunctio nec miscet personas, nec unit substantias: sed affectus consociat, et confœderat voluntates*: “The conjunction that is between us and Christ neither minglenth persons nor uniteth substances: but joineth affections, and knitteth wills.” Likewise saith St. Cyril: *Initium et fundamentum in sanctificatione Christus est, per fidem scilicet, et non aliter: hoc enim modo in nobis habitat*: “The beginning and foundation of our holiness is Christ: by faith I mean, and none otherwise. For in this sort Christ dwelleth in us⁶².” Likewise Lyra, one of your own late doctors: *In quantum per sacramentum eucharistiæ unimur Deo, vivimus spiritualiter.....: nostra autem unio apud ipsum est per fidem et dilectionem*: “So far forth as we are united unto God by the sacrament of thanksgiving, we live spiritually: but the union that is between him and us, is by faith and love.” And expounding these words of St. Paul, *Qui adhæret Deo, unus spiritus est*, “He that cleaveth unto God, is one spirit with God,” he saith: *Unus, non secundum rem, sed secundum affectionem*: “He is one spirit with God, not one indeed, or according to the truth, but one in affection, or according to love.”

And yet somewhat farther to remove you from your phantasy of your *real presence*, St. Chrysostom saith, as he is alleged before: *Dominum ipsum amplecteris: cum illo commisceris: et (subrectus⁶³) conjungeris corpori illi, quod sursum sedet in cælis*: “Thou embracest the Lord himself: thou art *tempered* with him: and being carried up” (by faith and affection) “thou art joined with that body that sitteth in heaven.” In like sense saith Leo: *Christus ineffabili modo cæpit esse divinitate præsentior, qui factus est*

Cyprian [*leg. Arnold.*] de Cæna Domini. [app. cxi.]

Cyrrill. in Johan. lib. 4. cap. 29. [iv. 393.]

Nicol. Lyra in Johan. cap. 6. [v. 1132.]

Nicol. Lyra, 1 Cor. vi. [vi. 241.]

Chrysost. in Epist. ad Coloss. hom. 6. [xi. 370.]

Leo de Ascensione Domini, serm. 3. [*leg. 2. i. 315.*]

⁶² [S. Cyrill. in Johan. lib. 4. ἀρχὴ γὰρ ἡμῶν καὶ θεμέλιος εἰς ἀγί- ασμόν καὶ δικαιοσύνην Χριστὸς, διὰ

πίστεως δὲ δηλονότι, καὶ οὐχ ἑτέρως· οὕτω γὰρ ἡμῶν ἐνοικίζεται.]

⁶³ [Supra p. 88, note ⁵⁹.]

humanitate longinquior: “Christ by unspeakable means began to be *the nearer to us by his divinity, the further he is made from us by his humanity.*”

I doubt not, M. Harding, but ye may easily see, that hitherto your *real presence* is but weakly proved.

M. HARDING.

Again, we marvel with what face ye dare allege Theophylact for you, who in most evident words overthroweth your figurative, tropical, and energical doctrine touching this blessed sacrament. For he saith upon this sixth chapter of St. John: “Mark well, that the bread which is eaten of us in the mysteries *is not only a certain figure* of our Lord’s flesh, but the flesh itself of our Lord. For he said not, ‘The bread that I shall give is the figure of flesh,’ but, ‘It is my flesh.’ For the bread is with secret words, through the mystical blessing and coming upon of the Holy Ghost, changed into the flesh of our Lord.”.....

a Untruth.
For he manifestly affirmeth a figure. His words be these: “It is not only a figure:” *ergo*, he granteth it is a figure.

Not a figure, but the flesh itself of our Lord. Transubstantiation.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Theophylact saith: “The bread is not only a certain figure of our Lord’s flesh, but the flesh itself of our Lord.” This objection in my former Reply is many wheres answered. We grant, *the bread is not a bare or naked figure*: but, by way of sacrament or mystery, it is the body of Christ itself. So the *water of baptism* is not an empty figure of the blood of Christ: but it is Christ’s blood itself, because it is the sacrament of Christ’s blood. And therefore St. Bernard saith: *Lavemur in sanguine ejus*: “Let us be washed” (not in *water*, but) “in the blood of Christ.” St. Augustine giveth this general rule, as I have often reported: *In sacramentis videndum est, non quid sint, sed quid significant* [leg. *ostendant*]: “In sacraments we must consider, *not what they be*” (in substance and nature), “*but what they signify.*” Tertullian saith: *Christus acceptum panem, et discipulis suis distributum, corpus suum illum fecit, dicendo, Hoc est corpus meum, hoc* [leg. *id*] *est, Figura corporis mei*: “Christ having taken the bread, and having delivered the same to his disciples, *made it his body*, saying, ‘This is my body,’ *that is to say, This is a figure of my body.*” And to appoint a corruptible creature to this use, and to make it an effectual instrument of such high

Bernard. Super Missus est, hom. 3. [lib. 755.]

Augustin. contra Maxim. lib. 3. [cap. 22. viii. 725.]

Tertull. contra Marcion. lib. 4. [cap. 40. pp. 457, 458.]

and hidden mysteries, it is not the work of any mortal man, but the only power and working of the Holy Ghost : as it shall further appear in the next clause, in mine answer to the words of St. Ambrose. Beda saith thus :.....*Panis et vini creatura in sacramentum carnis et sanguinis Christi ineffabili Spiritus sanctificatione transfertur* : "The creature of bread and wine, by the unspeakable sanctification of the Holy Ghost, is changed" (not into very real body and blood, but) "*into the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ.*"

Bedain Octavis Epiphan. [leg. in Epiphan. int. Hyemales de Sanctis.]

M. HARDING.

Neither maketh St. Ambrose, which also ye bring in, any better for you. Would God ye would admit him for umpire in this point. Verily in the book and chapter that ye refer us unto, he disputeth as it were of purpose against you, as though he foresaw the time when the church should be troubled with the heresy of sacramentaries.....*Tu forte dicis*, &c. "Perhaps thou sayest, My bread is common : but this bread is bread before the words of the sacraments : so soon as consecration cometh, of bread is made the flesh of Christ. Let us then avouch this, how that which is bread may be the body of Christ by consecration. Then with what words and speeches is consecration made ? Even with those of our Lord Jesus. For whatsoever else is said, (he meaneth at the mass,) it is praisegiving to God, and praying for the people, for kings, for the rest. When the priest cometh to the consecration of the honourable sacrament, there he useth not his own words, but the words of Christ. Therefore it is the word of Christ that maketh the sacrament. ^a What word of Christ ? Soothly that same, whereby all things be made. Our Lord commanded, and heaven was made. Our Lord commanded, and earth was made. Our Lord commanded, and the seas were made. Our Lord commanded, every creature was engendered. Seest thou then how workful is the word of Christ ? Well then, if there be so great power in the word of our Lord Jesus, that things began to be which were not : how much more is it workful," ^b *ut sint quæ erant, et in aliud commutentur* ? "that things be, which were, and be changed into another thing ?" Here, sir defender, construe me these words, and what sense can you draw forth of them but this : If by the working power of our Lord's word things have a being, which before were nothing, and had no being at all, as heaven, earth, and seas : how much more power hath it to work, that things which were before, and had a being, now also be, or have a being, but be changed into another thing, *in aliud*, ^c into a thing of another substance ? For by this phrase is signified a substantial changing, which aptly is called *transubstantiation* : and I pray you, good sir, who saith, that the

^a God may well be omnipotent without either transubstantiation, or real presence.

^b St. Ambrose saith, The bread and wine are the same things they were before consecration : notwithstanding they be now made a sacrament.

^c Untrue exposition. That were contrary to St. Ambrose. For then were they not the same things they were before.

De Sacr. lib. 4. cap. 4. De Pane. [ii. 368.] Consecration.

^aoperatorius. These be the words alleged by the defender.

d O fond
folly ! What
being have
things when
their sub-
stance is
gone ?

e A vain un-
truth. See
the Answer.

M. Harding's
modesty.

elements, I mean bread and wine, pass quite away, and go to nothing? Though you so bely us, we say not so: God forbid. We say that after consecration they be: but what? ^d Not the selfsame they were, whereby the former substance is excluded, but the body and blood of our Lord. Again, in that we say with St. Ambrose, *In aliud commutantur*: "They be changed into another thing:" followeth it not thereof by good logic, *ergo*, they be? will not this argument hold in school, the verb passive being resolved, *e sunt commutata, ergo sunt*? For that which ceaseth to be, or goeth to nothing, ye cannot properly say of it, that it is changed: but rather, that it is ended or perisheth. Now sir, I report me to every man that hath any sense, whether I may not lawfully give you the *menti*, as for manner's sake I may use the Italian term, and challenge you in plain terms of a lie, for uttering this untruth upon that holy doctor St. Ambrose, specially speaking as you do in your English translation, by yourself allowed, thus: "For what can be said more plainly, than that which Ambrose saith, 'bread and wine remain still the same they were before, and yet are changed into another thing?'" Zeal moveth me to say, beyond the modesty of my natural disposition, What is juggling, what is lying, what is falsehood, what is falsifying, what is wickedness of falsaries, if this be not?

Neither is the saying, wherewith this defender beliieth St. Ambrose, all only false, and contrary to the catholic faith, but also absurd, unreasonable, and foolish. For if bread and wine remain still after consecration the same they were before⁶², how then are they changed into another thing?.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here, M. Harding, unless ye have made St. Ambrose a prophet, ye thought he could not so handsomely have served your turn. But what, and of whom he prophesied, and how far he saw before, we shall see hereafter. Verily, if that be the heresy that you imagine, then he needed not greatly any spirit of prophecy in that behalf. For he foretold us of no new *heresy* that was to come: but rather told us of his own *heresy*, that then was present. Doubtless the words that we report are not ours: they are his own.

But St. Ambrose saith: "The omnipotent power of the word, wherewith God made heaven and earth, the same omnipotent power of the same word he useth now in the consecration of the sacrament." "Therefore," saith M. Harding, "it must needs be gathered, he meant transub-

⁶² ["as the lady interpreteth."]

The elements
after conse-
cration be, or
have a being.

stantiation, and real presence:" as if without these new phantasies God could not be *omnipotent*. I may well answer these men, as St. Ambrose upon the like occasion sometime answered the wilful blindness of the Jews: *Atramentum vident: Spiritum Dei non vident*: "They see the ink" (of the letter written), "but the Spirit of God they see not." Even so M. Harding, and others of that side, weigh the words of St. Ambrose: but his sense and meaning they weigh not.

Certainly God sheweth his *omnipotent power*, as well in the sacrament of *baptism*, as in the sacrament of *thanksgiving*. Hereof I have said somewhat, as occasion was offered, in my former Reply to M. Harding. Leo saith thus: *Christus originem, quam sumpsit in utero virginis, posuit in fonte baptismatis. Dedit aquæ, quod dedit matri*: Ambros. de Noe et Arca. [l. 245.] "Christ laid in the font of baptism the same beginning that he took in the virgin's womb. *He gave the same pre-eminence to the water, that he gave to his mother.*" Even so Chrysostom: *Angeli qui adfuerunt (in baptismo) tam inenarrabilis operis modum minime possunt enarrare. Adfuerunt tantum, et viderunt: nihil tamen operati sunt: sed Pater tantum, et Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus*: Articulo 5. Division 4. [ii. p. 337.] "The angels that were present at the baptism are not able to utter *the manner of that unspeakable work*. They were present only, and saw, but they did nothing: but only the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost ⁶³." Likewise he saith: *Ex Spiritu, et (sensibili) aqua, omnia hæc admirabilia, et humanam excedentia cogitationem, exoriuntur*: Leo in Nativitate Domini, serm. 5. [l. 160.] "All these wonderful works" (wrought in *baptism*), "so far exceeding the thought of man, spring of the Spirit, and of sensible water."

Thus the holy fathers used oftentimes to advance and to magnify the holy mysteries, the better to bring their hearers to the deep and inward consideration of the same: and therefore, as St. Augustine saith: *Sacramenta [leg. sacramentum] tantæ rei non nisi ejusdem rei vocabulo nuncuparunt [leg. nuncupavit]*: Chrysost. in Johan. hom. 24. [viii. 144.] "They expressed the sacraments of so great a thing none otherwise than *by the name of the same thing*." So St. Paul saith: "The Rock was Christ." Augustin. ad Bonifac. epist. 23. [ii. 268.] 1 Cor. x. 4.

⁶³ [The original is printed supra ii. 397, note ⁹⁴.]

Pachymer.
in 4. cap.
Hierarch.
[p. 160.]
S. German.
De Corpore
et Sanguine
Christi.

So another saith, as I have otherwheres⁶³ alleged: "The Oil is Christ." And another: "*Manna erat Christus, qui descendit de celo*:" "The Manna" (that rained in the wilderness) "*was Christ*, that came down from heaven." Thus are we taught, that "Manna was Christ," that "the Oil was Christ," and that the "Rock was Christ." And these sayings are true. And yet indeed and verily, in nature and substance, neither the *Manna* nor the *Oil* nor the *Rock* was Christ.

Chrysost. in
Psal. l. hom.
1. [v. 581.]

So saith St. Chrysostom, reporting the story of David: "*Accipiens aquam allatam, bibere noluit: sed semetipsum reprehendit, et Domino eam libavit. Non enim aqua erat, sed sanguis*:" "David receiving of the water," (that his men had gotten with great danger from the midst of their enemies,) "would not drink of it: but found fault with himself, and poured it out unto the Lord. *For it was not water, but blood*⁶⁴."

I beseech thee, good Christian reader, mark well these words. The story is clear. It was indeed only a cup of water, and nothing else. Yet Chrysostom saith: "*It was blood: it was no water.*"

In those days it was no danger thus to say. The people was instructed, and well acquainted with this phrase or manner of speech, and knew the meaning. They were taught, that the *Rock*, the *Oil*, and the *Manna* in the wilderness, were only sacraments of Christ: and that, notwithstanding they were called by the name of Christ, yet in deed and in substance they were not Christ.

Augustin.
contra Julian.
anum, lib. 1.
cap. 2. [x.
511.]

Athanas.
contra Arian.
serm. 4. [p.
224. ed.
Basil. 1556.]

Therefore I may answer M. Harding herein, as St. Augustine sometime answered the Pelagian *heretics*:..... *Vobis Pelagianis nondum litigantibus, securius loquebantur patres de his articulis*: "Before that you the Pelagians began to quarrel, the fathers and doctors spake without fear and freely of these articles⁶⁵." Athanasius saith of the Arian *heretics*: *Incorporalia corporaliter excipientes, quæ*

⁶³ [Supra vol. iii. p. 105.]

⁶⁴ [The Homily on Psal. l. is rejected as spurious by the Ben. ed.—Saville defends its genuineness.]

⁶⁵ [S. Augustin. contra Julian. "... vobis nondum litigantibus "securius loquebatur;" scil. Chrysostomus.]

probe dicta erant, interpretationibus depravaverunt: "Taking spiritual things in a corporal or fleshly meaning," (as doth M. Harding, and others his fellows,) "by their interpretations they have depraved the things that were rightly spoken."

St. Ambrose saith of the *bread* and the *wine*: *Sunt quæ erant, et in aliud mutantur*: "They remain the same that they were, and are changed into another thing." Now is the field won: M. Harding bloweth a main triumph. "Here," saith he, "sir defender, construe me these words." Soothly, good reader, I distrust not greatly, but this poor defender might easily "construe these words," were he never so simple a clerk. The *natural creatures of the bread and wine* in the supper of our Lord, saith St. Ambrose, remain still in substance as they were before: *yet are they changed into another thing*: that is to say, they are made the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ: which before they were not.

Notwithstanding this short construction, being clear and plain, may seem sufficient, yet for that M. Harding so deeply apposeth us, and willeth us to *construe him these words*, we will both *construe* and *parse* them too for his pleasure.

Therefore to warrant our former *construction*, St. Augustine saith thus: *Accedat verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum*: "Let the word be added to the element, or outward creature, and it is made a sacrament," that is to say, *another thing*. Again he saith: *Sacramenta sunt signa rerum, aliud existentia, aliud significantia*: "Sacraments are signs or tokens of things, *being by substance one thing, and signifying another thing*." So saith Chrysostom of the water of baptism: *Cum hoc elementum acceperit Spiritum Sanctum, fit sacramentum: et jam non erit aqua potationis, sed sanctificationis: non erit aqua communis, sed refectio*: "When this creature of water hath received the Holy Ghost, it is made a *sacrament*: and now it is not water to drink, but water to sanctify: not common water, but water to refresh⁶⁶."

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
80. [lib. pt. 2.
703.]

Augustin.
contra Maxi-
min. lib. 3.
cap. 2. [leg.
cap. 22. viii.
724.]

Chrysostom.
in Psal. xxii.
[Lat. ed.
1588. tom. i.
p. 701.]

⁶⁶ [This sermon on Psal. xxii. is not printed in the Ben. ed.]

Thus the element, or outward creature, both *remaineth*, and is *changed*: it *remaineth* in proper and plain kind of speech: it is *changed* improperly, that is to say, by the way of a sacrament, or a mystery. So M. Harding's own Gloss saith upon the Decrees: *Cœleste sacramentum..... dicitur corpus Christi, sed improprie. Unde dicitur, Suo modo: non rei veritate, sed significante* [al. *significati*] *mysterio: ut sit sensus, Vocatur corpus Christi, id est, significat corpus Christi*: "The heavenly sacrament is called the body of Christ, but *improperly*" (that is to say, not in plain and simple manner of speech). "Therefore St. Augustine saith, 'It is so called *after a sort*;' that is, *not in truth of matter, but by a mystery signifying*: that the sense may be this, It is called the body of Christ, that is to say, It *signifieth the body of Christ*." So saith St. Augustine: *De signis differens, hoc dico, Ne quis in eis attendat quod sunt, sed potius, quod signa sunt, id est, quod significant*: "Intreating of signs" (or sacraments) "thus I say: Let no man consider in them *that they be in substance*, but rather that they be *signs*, that is to say, *that they signify*" (some other thing). In this sense and meaning St. Augustine saith again: *Dominus ait, Ipse (Johannes) est Elias: Johannes autem ipse ait, Ego non sum Elias: recte ergo Johannes proprie respondit: nam Dominus figurate*: "Our Lord said of John the Baptist, '*This is Elias*;' but John himself saith, '*I am not Elias*.' Therefore John answered well in *plain manner of words*: for our Lord spake in a *figure*." Thus, in sundry sorts of speech, John *is* Elias: and the same John *is not* Elias: and both are true.

But what better expositor of St. Ambrose can we find than St. Ambrose himself? I trust M. Harding will not say, that so holy a father was a *falsifier* and a *liar*, specially in declaring his own mind. Thus therefore he saith: *Ante benedictionem verborum cœlestium alia species nominatur: post consecrationem corpus Christi significatur.—In comedendo et potando, carnem et sanguinem quæ pro nobis oblata sunt, significamus. In similitudinem accipis sacramentum.—Est figura corporis et sanguinis Domini. Similitudinem pretiosi sanguinis bibis*: "Before the blessing of

De Con. dist.
2. Hoc est.
In Glossa.

Augustin. de
Doctrina
Christian.
lib. 2. cap. 1.
[iii. 19.]

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
4. [iii. pt. 2.
315.]

Ambros. de
lis qui initia-
ntur, cap. 9.
[ii. 339.]
Ambros.
1 Cor. xi.
[ii. app. 149.]
Ambros. de
Sacrament.
lib. 4. cap. 4
and 5. [ii.
371.]

the heavenly words, *it is called another kind*: after the words of consecration, the *body of Christ is signified*. In eating and drinking, we *signify the body and blood*, that were offered for us. Thou receivest the sacrament for a *similitude*, or for a likeness. It is a *figure* of the body and blood of our Lord. Thou drinkest the *likeness of the precious blood*⁶⁷."

The like form of words the same St. Ambrose useth of the sacrament of *baptism*: *Vidisti aquam? Sed non omnis aqua sanat: sed aqua sanat, quæ habet gratiam Dei* [leg. *Christi*]. *Aliud est elementum: aliud consecratio*: "Hast thou seen the water? But all water healeth not. But that water healeth, that hath the grace of God. *The element*" (or creature of water) "*is one thing: and the consecration is another thing*."

Ambros. de
Sacrament.
lib. 1. cap. 5.
[ii. 352.]

Thus the bread *remaineth*: and thus it is *changed*. It *remaineth in substance*: it is *changed in mystery*.

But M. Harding heavily presseth these words, *Mutantur in aliud*: "That is," saith he, "into a thing of another substance. For by this phrase is signified a substantial changing, which aptly is called *transubstantiation*." I will not here use your courteous eloquence, M. Harding: nor say unto you, as you say to others, "I pray you, good sir," but thus I say: I pray you, M. Harding, who gave you this rule? who taught you this lesson? *de cælo est, an ex hominibus*? "came it from heaven, or is it of men?" have the holy fathers thus taught you, or is it only your own phantasy? what grammar, what logic, what philosophy, what divinity ever told you, that *aliud* evermore signifieth *a thing of another substance*? if ye have an *author*, why come you without him? if it be only of yourself, why should we believe you?

Augustin.
contra Max-
im. lib. 3.
cap. 22. [viii.
724.]

If *aliud* signify only a *substance*, and nothing else, why doth St. Augustine say, as it is before alleged: *Sacramenta sunt signa rerum, aliud existentia, aliud significantia*? why saith St. Augustine again: *Aliud est sacramentum, aliud virtus sacramenti*? why saith St. Ambrose: *Aliud*

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
26. [iii. pt. 2.
498.]

Ambros. de
Sacrament.
lib. 1. cap.
[ii. 352.]

⁶⁷ [Vide supra vol. i. p. 188, note ³⁰, and p. 159.]

est elementum, aliud consecratio? For by your divinity the sacrament, the form, the consecration, be accidents only, and may not be taken for the substance. Verily, for ought that I can learn, *aliud* is nothing else but *res alia*, another thing, whether it be the substance or the accident. For I think ye have not forgotten the old rule: *Unumquodque in suo genere est quid.*

M. Harding,
fol. 347 b.

Addition. ☞ M. Harding. “Who would think that a *Addition.*

man of your study and learning, and of that place, would say, and maintain it, that St. Ambrose meaneth, bread and wine after consecration to remain still in substance that which they were before.” *The answer.* Who would think that a man of your learning, M. Harding, would be so vain, or so wilful? have you forgotten that Gelasius saith:

Gelasius contra Eutychem. [Bibl. Patr. v. pt. 3. p. 671.]

Non desinit esse substantia vel natura panis et vini? “It ceaseth not to be the substance or nature of bread and wine?” have you forgotten that St. Chrysostom saith:

Chrysost. ad Cæsarium. [iii. 744.]

Natura panis remanet in sacramento? “The nature or substance of bread remaineth still in the sacrament⁶⁷?” or, that Theodoretus saith: *Christus naturam panis non mutat?*

Theodoret. dialog. i. [ap. Routh. ii. 132.]

“Christ changeth not the nature of the bread⁶⁸?” who would think you would refuse to expound one father by another?

M. Harding,
fol. 348 b.

M. Harding. “I will construe these words for him, and will shew his extreme blindness. *Ergo*, ‘then,’ *si tanta vis est*, ‘if so great strength be,’ *in sermone Domini Jesu*,

Fol. 349 a.

‘in the speech of our Lord Jesus,’ *ut*, ‘that,’ &c.: M. Jewel supplieth bread and wine to be the nominative case to the verb *sint*, ‘be,’ or rather, to the verb *sunt*. He beginneth the construction with the verb *sint*, whereas *quæ erant* should go before. Again, between *quæ* and *erant*, M. Jewel conveyeth in a pronoun demonstrative, which hath no place there, saying, which they were, &c. Is *sunt* to be Englished, ‘they remain the same?’ *Sunt* is no more, but, They be, &c. All St. Ambrose’ reason proceedeth to prove that God’s word is of force to change creatures:

Fol. 349 b.

⁶⁷ [On the Epistle of St. Chrysostom to Cæsarius see note ⁴⁴, supra vol. iii. 54.]

⁶⁸ [See the original printed supra vol. iii. p. 84, note ⁶⁴.]

and he meaneth of change in substance. For all his comparison consisteth about the words *non esse* and *esse*, and *esse* and *aliud esse*, &c. And who would not wonder to see St. Ambrose labour so vehemently to prove, that God's word is able to change a creature in quality, as though a man were not able to change a thing in quality? &c. When consecration is come unto it, *de pane*, from of bread, it is made Christ's flesh." *The answer.* Good reader, the words that I have already written may suffice thee for answer in this behalf. But whereas M. Harding seeketh to prevail by his pretty constructions, and thus nicely teacheth thee to expound St. Ambrose, *ergo*, "then:" *si*, "if:" *ut*, "that:" *sunt*, "be," that is to say, "have a being:" *quæ erant*, "should go before:" *sint*, "should follow after:" his dealing herein is light and childish, as thou mayest see, and not worthy of answer. "The bread and the wine," saith St. Ambrose, "are still that they were, and yet are changed into another thing." Here M. Harding crieth out: "These words, *bread* and *wine*,^{M. Harding, fol. 349 n.} are not in St. Ambrose. These words M. Jewel hath supplied to be the nominative case to the verb *sint*." To answer your grammatical divinity, M. Harding, if St. Ambrose meant not *bread and wine*, I pray you tell us, what things meant he? If ye say, he meant nothing, the children will laugh at you: if ye say, he meant any other things than *bread and wine*, it must needs follow, that some other things besides *bread and wine* are changed into Christ's body: which would be the overthrow of all your doctrine. St. Ambrose saith, by your own translation, as clear as midnight: "The things that were, be, or have a being, and they are changed into another thing." What things were they? what things have a being? what things are changed? Once again I say unto you, If St. Ambrose meant not *bread and wine*, I pray you tell us, what things meant he? if *bread and wine* be not changed, where is then your *transubstantiation of bread and wine*? if the *bread and wine* remain not, how say you that the *bread and wine* have a being? will you say, *They have a being*, and yet *be nothing*? Leave these devices, M. Harding: they become you not. Why should you so vainly encumber

the world with such follies? St. Ambrose saith: "They are changed into another thing." So may they be, though the former substance and nature of *bread and wine* remain still. But you say: "All St. Ambrose's reason proceedeth to prove that God's word is of force to change creatures," meaning, as you say, of change in substance. How know you that, M. Harding? Verily St. Ambrose himself seemeth not to know it. Behold his words: thus he saith:

M. Harding,
fol. 349 b.

Ambros. de
illis qui initi-
antur, cap. 9.
[ii. 33^b.]

"Moses lifted up his rod, and the water was divided, and stood as a wall: the water of Jordan turned his course, and contrary to nature flowed backward to his head. Is it not clear that nature was changed?" &c. Now tell us, M. Harding, call you this a change in *substance*? was not the water both of the Red sea, and of Jordan, in nature and substance as it was before? By these, and such other like examples, it appeareth, that, notwithstanding St. Ambrose say, "the nature is changed," yet he meant a change in quality only, and not in substance. But he saith: "Of

Chrysost. ad
Hebræ. hom.
16. [xii. 159.]

bread is made Christ's body." So Chrysostom saith: "The baptism of Christ is Christ's blood⁶⁹." But St. Ambrose saith not, The bread is no longer bread: or, The bread is really changed into Christ's body. His words agree thoroughly with the words of Tertullian that lived before him. For, as St. Ambrose saith: "Of the bread is made Christ's body:" even so saith Tertullian: *Christus accepit panem, et corpus suum illum fecit, dicendo, Hoc est corpus meum, hoc* [i. *id*] *est, figura corporis mei*: "Christ took bread, and made it his body, saying, 'This is my body,' that is to say, This is a figure of my body." The bread, saith he, is made the body of Christ. What thing can there be more plainly spoken? But he thought it good further to open his own meaning, lest any man should be deceived. "He made it his body," saith he, "that is to say, He made it a figure, or a sacrament of his body." Even so meant St. Ambrose: and the same meaning he hath many ways plainly uttered, as I have said before. These be his words: "the body of Christ is signified:" "we signify the flesh and blood of Christ:" "thou receivest the sacrament for a

Tertull. contra
Marcion.
lib. 4. [cap.
40. 45^b.]

⁶⁹ [Supra vol. iii. p. 8, note 7.]

likeness:" "thou drinkest the similitude of the precious blood:" "it is a figure of the body and blood of our Lord." In this sense St. Ambrose saith: "The bread is made Christ's body." You must give him leave of courtesy, M. Harding, to expound his own meaning, unless you know it better than he himself.

You say: "Who would not wonder to see St. Ambrose labour so vehemently to prove, that God's word is able to change a creature in quality, as though a man were not able to change a thing in quality?" and marvel you so much hercat, M. Harding? It appeareth, ye have not so advisedly considered the holy fathers. St. Cyprian, speaking only of the holy oil, saith thus: *Sanctificatis elementis, jam non propria natura præbet effectum: sed virtus divina potentius operatur: adest veritas signo, et Spiritus sacramento*: "When the elements" (of the oil) be sanctified, it is not the nature thereof that giveth effect: but the power of God worketh more mightily: the truth is present with the sign: and the Holy Ghost is present with the sacrament." "It is not nature," he saith, "it is the power of God." So earnestly he laboureth to prove a change: and yet is it a change, not in *substance*, as you know, but only in *quality*. Such extraordinary speeches be very common in the ancient writers. Bertramus, that lived about eight hundred years past, saith thus: "Christ of the manna that fell from heaven in the wilderness, invisibly made his own body: and of the water that flowed from the rock, invisibly he wrought his own blood⁷⁰." These words be vehement, as none may be more. Yet was this change in *quality* only, and not in *substance*. So saith Beda: *Panis et vini creatura in sacramentum carnis et sanguinis Christi, ineffabili Spiritus sanctificatione, transfertur*: "The creature of bread and wine, by the unspeakable sanctification of the Holy Ghost, is turned into the sacrament of Christ's flesh and blood." He saith not, It is changed in *substance*, or, It is really turned into Christ's

M. Harding,
fol. 349 b.

Cyprian.
[Arnold.] de
Unctione
Chrismatis.
[app. cxxiii.]

Bertram, de
Sacram. Eu-
char.

Beda. in Oc-
tavis Epipha-
niæ. [leg. in
Epiph. inter
Hyemales de
Sanctis.]

⁷⁰ [Bertram. "Ipse namque qui
"nunc in ecclesia omnipotenti vir-
"tute panem et vinum in sui cor-
"poris carnem et proprii cruoris
"undam spiritualiter convertit,
"ipse tunc quoque manna de
"cælo datum corpus suum, et
"aquam de petra profusam pro-
"prium sanguinem invisibiliter
"operatus est."]

flesh and blood : but only, “It is turned into the sacrament of Christ’s flesh and blood.” And therefore St. Ambrose, after all other his vehement words, saith thus : “*Vera utique caro Christi, quæ crucifixa est, quæ sepulta est : vere ergo carnis illius sacramentum est. Ipse clamat Dominus Jesus, Hoc est corpus meum. Ante benedictionem verborum cælestium alia species nominatur : post consecrationem corpus (Christi) significatur* : “That was the very true flesh of Christ, that was crucified, and that was buried : therefore this is verily a sacrament of that flesh. The Lord Jesus himself saith, ‘This is my body.’ Before the benediction of the heavenly words it is named another kind : after the consecration the body of Christ is signified.”

Ambros. de
illis qui initi-
antur, cap. 9.
[ii. 339.]


And, lest any man should wonder at these strange kinds of speeches, like as St. Ambrose speaketh of the changing of the bread in our Lord’s supper, even so he speaketh of the changing of the water in the sacrament of baptism. These be his words : “First of all the apostle teacheth thee, not to behold” (in baptism) “the things that are seen, but the things that are not seen, &c. Believe therefore the presence of the Godhead. Believest thou the work, and believest thou not the presence? &c. Believe not only the eyes of the body. That thing is better seen, that is not seen; &c. This is that mystery that eye never saw, that ear never heard, that never entered into the heart of man, &c. To them of the Jews an angel came down : unto thee cometh down the Holy Ghost. Unto them the creature of the water was stirred : unto thee Christ himself worketh, that is the Lord of the creature, &c. Believe therefore that our Lord Jesus is present in baptism at the prayer of the priest, &c. Say not, How are we regenerate? I know not here the use of nature. The order of nature is not there, whereas is the excellency of God’s grace.” These and such other like words St. Ambrose uttereth, only touching *the sacrament of baptism*. “Believe not,” saith he, “thy bodily eyes : God’s word is workful. Here is no order of nature : grace excelleth : nature yieldeth : Christ is the Lord of the creature ; God is present : Christ is present.” So earnestly he laboureth

De illis qui
initiant, cap.
3. [ii. 327.]

Cap. 4. [ibid.
329, 330.]

Cap. 5. [ibid.
332.]
Cap. 9. [ibid.
342.]

to prove this change. And yet is it a change, not in *substance*, but only in *quality*. Such change is there in the *water*. Such change is there in the *bread and wine*.

Last of all, whereas I have thus Englished these words, *sunt quæ erant*, "they remain the same that they were," ye charge me with false translation: "Is *sunt*," say you, "to be Englished, 'they remain the same?' *Sunt* is no more but, 'they be.' If St. Ambrose would have said as you untruly translate him, his words had been these: *Manent eadem*." Your objection is pretty, M. Harding. We will not here dispute of the propriety of words. Be it that *est* may not commonly be Englished *to remain*: yet sometimes perhaps, and in some sentence, it may well bear this English. Jeremy saith: *Rachel plorat filios suos, ... quia non sunt*: David saith: *Laudabo Dominum quamdiu sum*: Jerem. xxxi. 15. Psal. ciii. 34. what if a man would thus English these words: "Rachel bewaileth her children, because they remain not:" "I will praise the Lord, while I remain alive?" would you therefore condemn him of heresy? or would you say, *sum* may not be Englished, *to remain*? As for the place of St. Ambrose, it seemeth, it may well so be Englished: *sunt quæ erant*: "they remain that they were before." If this mislike you, we will follow your own English, and say thus: "they are that they were before." Now, I pray you, what advantage have you gotten by this exchange? But you say: "If St. Ambrose had thus meant, he would have said, *Manent eadem*." That may well be doubted. For St. Ambrose is not always most curious in choice of words. Howbeit, although he say it not, yet others have said it. For, as it is alleged before, St. Chrysostom saith: *Natura panis remanet in sacramento*: "The nature of bread remaineth in the sacrament." And Chrysost. ad Cesarium. [lii. 744.] Gelasius saith: "It ceaseth not to be the substance or nature of bread and wine." If it cease not to be, then must you confess, *it remaineth still*. And thus have you found that very same word, that so hath offended you. 

We say, *The nature and substance of the bread and wine is not clearly changed, or consumed into nothing, as many have dreamed in these latter days*. Here M. Harding cometh

Prov. xxviii.
1.

roughly in, as his manner is, and saith : “ Ye bely us : we say not so : God forbid.” Thus he crieth out, before he be stricken. Solomon saith : *Impius fugit, nemine persequente* : “ The guilty flieth, before he be chased.” For, notwithstanding there be multitudes of follies in his doctrine, yet with this folly we charge him not. But whether any of his fellows have so said or no, I report me to his master, Peter Lombard. His words be these : *Quid ergo fit de substantia panis et vini ? Illi dicunt, vel in præjacentem materiam resolvi, vel in nihilum redigi* : “ What then becometh of the substance of the bread and wine ? They say, either that it is resolved into the matter that was before, or else, that it is consumed into nothing.”

4. Sent. dist.
11. Quidam.

What ? “ Into nothing ? Marry, God forbid,” saith M. Harding. So coy, and so careful he is for his holy *forms*, and his *kingdom of accidents*. He saith : “ The whole substance of the bread is clean abolished, not one part thereof remaining : yet may it not be turned into nothing.” And, as if the matter were well worth somewhat, he assur-eth the same sadly with a great detestation, “ God forbid : God shield the bread.” Hereof something might be said, if it were any thing worth the hearing. But, good reader, thou shalt lose nothing by the silence : for I assure thee, verily it is worth nothing.

Yet M. Harding first giveth us his courteous *menti* : and afterward, in his familiar manner, chargeth us by plain terms with a *lie* : and suddenly crieth out, as he saith, “ beyond the modesty of his natural disposition, what is juggling : what is lying : what is falsehood : what is falsifying : what is wickedness of falsaries, if this be not ? ” I might say, O sirs, hold the man. Good Christian reader, in all these whats, thou wilt haply think there should be somewhat. Howbeit, indeed it is but a pang of M. Harding’s rhetoric. He speaketh not thus of his *own natural disposition*, as he himself saith, but of art and study : lest thou shouldest think, that, having spent so many waste words, in the end he had said nothing.

But what is the matter, M. Harding ? what moveth you to make this piteous outcry ? Forsooth, because we say :

“The bread and wine remain the same they were before.” But these be St. Ambrose’s own words, they be not ours: we make them not: we change them not, but report them simply, as we find them. As they were written in Latin by the *author*, these they are: (*Panis et vinum*) *sunt, quæ erant, et in aliud mutantur*: “The bread and wine are the same that they were: and are changed into another thing.” Therefore it appeareth, all these exclamations of “what is juggling? what is lying?” &c. pertain unto St. Ambrose the *author* hereof, and not unto us.

Now, forsomuch as it hath pleased M. Harding so earnestly to call us forth to *construe him these words*, I beseech thee, good reader, mark well, what *constructions* he and his fellows have imagined and fancied upon the same. First of all Lanfrancus, the chiefest champion of that side, thought it the wisest way utterly to deny these words, and to say: “They were never written by St. Ambrose.” For thus he stormeth against Berengarius: *O mentem amentem! O hominem impudenter mentientem! O puniendam temeritatem! Ambrosium accire testem præsumis, quod panis et vinum altaris, per consecrationem non desinant* [*desinunt*] *esse, quod erant, sed commutentur* [*commutantur*] *in aliud, quod non erant? Et quidem si de sacramentis, seu (de) cæteris, de quibus Ambrosius scripsit, omnes revolcat* [*revoltas*] *libros, quos ecclesia in usu nunc habet, tale quid ab Ambrosio dictum, taliterque expositum, nusquam reperire valebit* [*valebis*]: “O mad mind! O impudent liar! O rashness worthy of punishment! darest thou to allege St. Ambrose for a witness, that the bread and wine of the altar leave not by consecration to be that they were before: but are changed into another thing, that they were not? Now truly if he peruse all the books that St. Ambrose hath written, either of the sacraments or of other matters, I mean such books as the church hath now in use, he shall never find any thing so written by St. Ambrose, and so expounded.”

Lanfrancus,
de Eucharist.
[Opp. p. 238.]

But M. Harding thought, he might not well thus do without impeachment of his modesty. For the very same

words are to be found extant, and apparent in every book. Therefore allowing the words, he thought it best to follow his master Peter a Soto, and to delay and qualify the same with some construction.

Thus therefore he saith: *Sunt, quæ erant, et in aliud mutantur*: “Doth it not follow by good logic, *mutata sunt, ergo sunt*, they be changed: ergo, they be?” In Louvain, perhaps: in other universities, I doubt whether it have hitherto been allowed, or no. For by this logic, whereas St. Hierom saith: *Superbia mutata est in humilitatem*, M. Harding may conclude, as he doth now, *Superbia mutata est: ergo est*: “Pride is changed into humility: ergo, pride is, or remaineth still.” And whereas St. Paul saith: *Commutarunt veritatem Dei in mendacium*: by this logic M. Harding may say: *Mutata est, ergo est*: “The truth of God is changed into a lie: ergo, it is God’s truth still notwithstanding.”

Hieron. in
Matt. cap. 18.
[iv. 81.]

Rom. i. 25.

And to take further view of M. Harding’s construction, thus he saith: *Panis et vinum sunt, quæ erant, id est, qualia erant*: “The bread and wine be in substance the same that they were: that is to say, they be in qualities or accidents as they were.” They are changed, in *aliud*, into another thing: that is, into another substance. They are changed: that is, they are transubstantiate. They be, that is, they be not: that they were, that is, that they were not. Thus substance is *accidens*: *accidens* is substance: being is not being: not being is being: remaining is not remaining: changing is not changing: and the same thing is not the same.

With such pretty constructions M. Harding can teach us to expound the ancient fathers. These be their keys of the kingdom of heaven. Herewith there is nothing so close shut, but they can open it: there is nothing so open, but they can shut it. Here might I conclude with M. Harding’s own words, and rightly say, as he saith: “What is juggling? what is lying?” &c. But it shall be best to leave his own eloquence and modesty to himself.

M. HARDING.

The places of Gelasius and Theodoret in appearance seem to make much for you, and more than any other doctors.....And though these two doctors were altogether of this opinion, that after consecration the substance of bread and wine remaineth, what reason is it they only in so great a matter should prejudicate all other holy and learned fathers, and, which is more, the general councils, and ^a the whole church of Christ?.....The catholic faith we find in them both within few lines after the words of this defender's objection, first by Gelasius thus expressed: *Sacramenta corporis et sanguinis Domini in divinam transeunt, Spiritu Sancto perficiente, substantiam: permanent tamen in sua proprietate naturæ*: "The sacraments," saith he, "of the body and blood of our Lord pass over into a divine substance by the working of the Holy Ghost; yet remain they still in the propriety of their own nature." By divine substance he meaneth the flesh of our Lord assumed of the word. Now saith Theodoretus, "The mystical tokens be understood to be the things which they be made and are believed and adored, as being the things which they are believed to be." But every man knoweth they are believed to be made the body and blood of Christ, and therefore be duly adored and worshipped. So after the mind of Theodoret, they be the body and blood indeed, not bread and wine, as before consecration⁷⁰.....

"The substance or nature of bread and wine ceaseth not to be," saith Gelasius: (whereas your interpreter addeth of her own head this word *so* :) ^b we tell you and her, in Theodoret it is not so. *Ergo*, it remaineth, say ye. We grant, the substance or nature of bread and wine remaineth after consecration, so as Gelasius understandeth by the name of substance, ^c which is nothing else but the very nature, (as commonly we speak of nature,) that is to say, the natural properties of bread and wine; for so he expoundeth himself afterward, saying, "Yet they remain in the propriety of their own nature." "They remain," (likewise saith Theodoret) "in their former substance, figure, and form, and be seen and felt as before....."

And thereto may Damascen's definition of substance pertain, who saith, that substance is every that whatsoever by itself is being, and hath not being in another. And therefore ^d with the accidents have their being by themselves in this sacrament, and be not stayed on any other thing, in this consideration substance of them may so be reported as if themselves were substance. Which ^e substantial consisting of the accidents lacking a proper name, because it is the mighty and extraordinary hand of God, is also extraordinarily called of Gelasius and Theodoretus by the name which the thing had before, to wit, the substance of bread

^a Untruth. For this phantasy was never allowed through the whole church of Christ: as it shall appear.

^b Untruth: without question it is so. For the words be, *Non desinit esse substantia panis.*
^c A peevish untruth. It had been too great a folly.

^d Untruth manifest; read the answer.

^e Substantial consisting of accidents; O folly!

⁷⁰ [Many of the passages which are left out here are subsequently noticed by Bishop Jewel out of their regular order.]

f O exact
folly! A heap
of untruths
without
sense.

and wine. And no marvel if they spake not in ^f most exact wise of this secret point of doctrine, (*of forms and accidents*⁷⁰), at what time it was not as yet by the church so clearly and fully discussed, (*as it was never yet until this day*⁷⁰.) But sithence of the schoolmen (*ignorant and fantastical sophisters*⁷⁰) it hath been more distinctly named the existence of accidents without their subject, that is, without another thing whereupon they might stay.

g Untruth.
M. Harding
by one dream
expoundeth
another.

Again, whereas bread and wine by their nature do nourish, g this virtue also remaineth in the accidents given to them by the almighty word of God, who changeth creatures to their bettering, not to their impairing. This was the meaning of Gelasius and Theodoretus, where they say, the bread and wine to remain in their former substance or nature. Otherwise should they be contrary to themselves, as they which also do acknowledge the nature of bread and wine to be changed into a more excellent substance by the workful word of Christ.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

As for these two fathers, Gelasius and Theodoretus, notwithstanding M. Harding would seem to make small account of them, for that they be, as he saith, *but only two*, yet he rather catcheth hold in some dark or doubtful word by them uttered, than he would seem utterly to give them over. Gelasius saith: "The sacraments pass over into a divine substance." If he had said, "They pass over into a divine accident," it would somewhat better have shadowed these men's purpose. But other *divine substance* M. Harding can imagine none, saving only Christ's body substantially and really contained under the forms of bread and wine. And this phantasy, notwithstanding Gelasius never knew it, must needs be allowed against all that Gelasius himself can say to the contrary.

But if M. Harding had better remembered the placing and meaning of this word *substantia*, and that as well Gelasius as other learned fathers use the same as [ed. 1570 *of*] divines, and not as natural philosophers, he should easily have found his own error.

It may please thee, therefore, good Christian reader, to understand, that the promise of mercy, the grace of God, our faith in Christ, God's word, and the holy sacraments, that are the aids and helps of our faith, are of the holy

⁷⁰ [The words in italics and between brackets are inserted by bishop Jewel.]

ancient writers called a *substance*. So St. Cyprian saith: *Substantiam salutis amittunt*: "They lose the *substance* of salvation." So saith Irenæus: *Quamvis sint in operibus materialibus, tamen putant se non amittere spirituales substantiam*: "Although they live in worldly or filthy works, yet they think they lose not the spiritual substance." Likewise again he saith of the follies and vanity of the Valentinian heretics: *Insubstantiativum ostendit figmentum ipsorum*: "He shewed that their inventions and devices were void of *substance*"⁷¹. So St. Chrysostom: *Fides dat substantiam rebus: imo potius non dat substantiam, sed ipsa est substantia earum*: "Faith giveth things their *substance*: or rather, it giveth not *substance* unto things, but itself is their *substance*." In like manner saith Tertullian: *Deus idololatriæ substantiam cohibuit*: "God forbad the *substance* of idolatry." So saith abbot Panormitane: *Continencia non est de substantia ordinis*: "Single or sole life is not of the *substance* of holy orders." And another saith: *Enim, non est de substantia consecrationis*: "This word *enim* is not of the *substance* of consecration." By these and other like examples it may appear, that in cases of religion *substance* is not evermore taken for Christ's body covered with accidents.

If all these examples will not yet suffice, to grow near to our purpose, St. Ambrose saith: *Quid est jejunium, nisi substantia et imago cælestis?* "What is fasting, but a *substance*, and an heavenly image?"

Likewise Tertullian calleth baptism, *divinam substantiam*: "A divine *substance*." His words be these: *Quid festinat innocens ætas, ad remissionem peccatorum? Cautius agitur [al. agetur] in sæcularibus: ut cui substantia terrena non creditur, divina credatur*. "Why hasteth this innocent age?" (he meaneth children) "to the remission of their sins? We are much more wary in worldly things. It is meet we should commit the sacrament of baptism, which is a *divine substance*, unto them unto whom we would not commit the *substance* of the earth."

⁷¹ [The Editor has not found the word ἀνύπαρκτον, as printed in the margin.]

Cyprian. De
Simpl. Præ-
lat. [p. 202.]
Irenæus, lib.
1. cap. 1. [p.
29.]

In eodem
cap. [p. 47.]

(ἀνύπα-
ρκτον,) ἀνυ-
πόστατον.

Chrysostom.
in Epist. ad
Hebr. hom.
21. [xli. 197.]

Tertull. ad-
versus Mar-
cion. lib. 2.
[cap. 22. p.
392.]

Abbas, Extra.
de Clericis
Conjugatis.
Cum Olim.

[in 3 lib. Ex-
tra. tom. iii.
fol. 16. col. 1.
a.]

Pupilla Ocu-
li. p. 14. [pt.
4. c. 4.]

Ambrose de
Ella et jeju-
nio, cap. 3. [l.
537.]

Tertull. de
Baptismo. [c.
18. pp. 231,
232.]

This is one of
Tertullian's
errors.

By these we may see, in what sense Gelasius calleth the sacrament of thanksgiving a divine substance. Verily none other ways, but even as St. Ambrose calleth *fasting a heavenly substance*: and as Tertullian calleth the sacrament of baptism by the same words, a divine substance. And what can all this avail M. Harding, to prove either his transubstantiation or his real presence?

But why dealeth he so doubly? Wherefore dissembleth he the words of Gelasius, that immediately in the same sentence went before? For Gelasius himself so clearly and plainly expoundeth his own mind, as no Lovanian doctor can do it better. Thus he saith: *Non desinit esse substantia panis, vel natura vini. Et certe imago, et similitudo corporis et sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebratur*: "There leaveth not to be the substance of bread, or the nature of wine. And indeed the image or representation and likeness of the body and blood of Christ is published in the ministration of the mysteries." And again in the words next immediately following: *Sacramenta transeunt in divinam, Spiritu Sancto perficiente, substantiam: permanent tamen in suæ proprietate naturæ*: "The sacraments, by the working of the Holy Ghost, pass into a divine substance: yet notwithstanding they remain still in the propriety of their own nature."

This image, or representation, or likeness, or memory of the body and blood of Christ is it, that Gelasius calleth the divine substance.

And in like sense St. Augustine calleth the same *cælestem panem*, "the heavenly bread." Thus he writeth, as he is alleged by Gratian: *Cælestis panis, qui caro Christi est, suo modo vocatur corpus Christi: cum revera sit sacramentum corporis Christi*: "The heavenly bread," (of the sacrament,) "which is the flesh of Christ, after this sort is called the body of Christ: whereas indeed it is the sacrament of Christ's body." Likewise saith St. Cyprian: *Diversa nomina, vel species ad unam reducuntur essentiam: et significantia, et significata eisdem vocabulis censentur*: "Divers names or kinds" (of things) "are brought unto one substance:" that is to say, "The things, that do signify,

Gelasius contra Eutychem, [Bibl. Patr. v. pt. 3. p. 671.]

De Con. dist. i. Hoc est, quod dicimus.

Cyprian, [Arnold] de Uncione Christianis, [app. cxv.]

and the things that be *signified*, are reckoned both by one name:" that is, as the body of Christ is called bread, 'so is the bread called Christ's body.

To be short, as Gelasius calleth the sacrament *a divine substance*, even so Gratian saith to the same purpose: *Quidam non improbabiler exponunt hoc loco, carnis, et sanguinis veritatem, ipsam earundem efficientiam, id est, peccatorum remissionem*: "Some there be that in this place, not without good reason, by these words, *the truth of Christ's flesh and blood, understand the effect or working of the same*, that is to say, the remission of sins."

For answer unto Theodoretus, it may please thee, for sparing of time, to read my former Reply to M. Harding. It is true, that Theodoret saith: "The mystical tokens," (that is to say) "the sacraments, be understood to be the things, which they be made, and believed." That is, that they be mysteries of Christ's body; or, that in a mystery, or by way of a sacrament, they be the body of Christ. But it is true also, that he saith, both immediately following in the same place, and also before: *Signa mystica post sanctificationem non recedunt a natura sua: manent enim in priori substantia, et figura, et forma*: "The mystical tokens" (or sacraments) "after the consecration depart not from their own nature: for they remain still in their former substance, and form, and figure"⁷². And, as I have often alleged out of St. Augustine: *In sacramentis videndum est, non quid sint, sed quid significant* [leg. ostendant]: "In sacraments we must consider *not what they be*" (in deed and of their own nature), "but what they signify."

So saith St. Chrysostom: *Antequam panis sanctificetur, panem eum nominamus: divina autem illum gratia sanctificante, mediante sacerdote, liberatus est quidem ab appellatione panis: dignus autem habitus est Dominici corporis appellatione: etiamsi natura panis in illo remanserit* [leg. permansit]: "Before the bread be sanctified, we call it bread. But after that, by the mean of the priest, the heavenly grace hath hallowed it, it is discharged from the

De Cons.
dist. 2. Species.

Art. 8. divis.
26. [supra
vol. iii. 57.] Et
art. 10. divis.
4. [iii. 95.]

Theodoret. in
2 Dialogo,
Inconfusus.
[Routh.
Opusc. ii. p.
132.]

Augustin.
contra Max.
lib. 3. cap.
22. [viii. 725.]

Chrysostom.
ad Caesarium.
[iii. 744.]

⁷² [Supra vol. iii. p. 8. note ⁶.]

name of bread, and is vouchsafed to be called by the name of our Lord's body; *notwithstanding the nature of the bread remain still.*"

Theodoret,
Dialog. i.
[Opp. tom.
iv. p. 17.]

So saith Theodoret himself: *Servator noster commutavit nomina : et corpori quidem symboli nomen dedit, symbolo vero nomen corporis*: "Our Saviour hath made exchange of the names: and unto his body hath given the name of" (bread, which is) "the sacrament: and *unto the sacrament hath given the name of his body.*"

Nevertheless, notwithstanding these words both of Theodoretus and of Gelasius (*The substance of bread and wine, after the words of consecration, remaineth still*) be so plain, that no man without blushing may deny them; yet hath M. Harding one good shift left in store. "The substance," saith he, "sometimes is used for the accident." Even as discreetly and to so good purpose as if he had said, Fire is water, or Light is darkness. And so by this construction *substance* sometimes is no *substance*. This is M. Harding's own peculiar divinity, without the witness of any of all the learned fathers, Greek or Latin, one or other. For, good reader, thou mayest not think, that any man, either well advised or learned, would say the like.

"The fathers," saith he, "spake not hereof in most exact wise." Perhaps they had not learned their logic rules, or understood not the principles of natural reason, no not so much as a child may easily understand; but used *substance* for *accidents*, *accidents* for *substance*, and one thing for another, as men that knew not what they said. Indeed, M. Harding, this is not, as you say, *exact wise*: it seemeth rather to be *exact folly*.

Ye add further, "Damascene saith, Substance is every that whatsoever by itself is being, and hath no being in another." What needed you here to allege Damascene? Children know, that Aristotle and others long before him wrote the like. Notwithstanding to this *major* ye set a *minor* of your own. "The accidents," say you, "have their being by themselves, and be not stayed in any other thing." O, M. Harding, this thing would have had some better proof. Why allege you not either St. Augustine,

or St. Ambrose, or St. Chrysostom, or St. Hierom, or some other catholic father to this purpose? Your simple word is no good warrant. Ye prove that thing, that is universally confessed, and needed no proof; but that ye should prove, ye leave unproved. This in *sophistry* is called *petitio principii*, the simplest shift that can be used. Damascene's *major* is confessed, and true: but your *minor* and conclusion are both untrue. For whereas you say of yourself: "The accidents have their being by themselves:" we say, The same *accidents* have their being in the bread and wine, as in their subjects. Sundry of your own fellows have said: "*Accidentia illa sunt in aere (tanquam in subjecto)*"⁷³: De Cons. dist. 2. Species. in Glossa. "These accidents are in the air (as in their subject)." Therefore by their judgment, "they have not their being," as you say, "by themselves." You may also remember that your master himself never durst precisely to determine this matter; but only passeth it over darkly and doubtfully, as being not well resolved what to say. His words be these: *Mihi videtur fatendum, accidentia illa existere sine subjecto*: "It seemeth unto me, or, as I can guess, these accidents have their being without a subject." Such is the assurance and certainty of your doctrine.

M. HARDING.

Euthym. in
fatt. vol. ii.
or 7.] ⁷⁴ "We must not behold," saith Euthymius, a Greek doctor, "the nature of the things which be set before us, ^a but the virtue or power of them ⁷⁴." ^a What is the virtue and power of your accidents?

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Euthymius, although one of the meanest doctors, saith right well, and as the learned fathers said before him. But, M. Harding, do you take your authors at all adventures, as they come to hand, or do you consider what they say? Tell us, I beseech you, in your phantasy, what are those things that Euthymius saith *are set before us*? Whe-

⁷³ [The words "tanquam in subjecto" are not in the passage cited.] of their proper order) from the middle of the last quotation from Harding.]

⁷⁴ [These words are taken (out

ther are they the *body and blood of Christ*, or else your *accidents*? If it be Christ's very *body and blood*, substantially, really, and indeed, *why should we not consider the nature of them*? What have they offended you? or what imperfection find you in them? Cyrillus saith: *Caro Christi natura vivifica est*: "The flesh of Christ by *nature* hath power to give life." And Christ himself saith: "My flesh is *verily* meat: and my blood is *verily* drink." Therefore the *nature* hereof is well worthy to be considered. But if there be nothing else there set forth but only your *bare and naked accidents*, what *power*, what *virtue* is there in them? What doctor or father ever taught us, that we should have remission of sin, and be saved by your *accidents*?

But, as I said, Euthymius writeth well, following herein the doctrine of the ancient learned fathers. St. Basil saith: *Si qua gratia est in aqua, ea non est ex natura aquæ, sed ex præsentia Spiritus*: "If there be any grace in the water" (of baptism) "it is *not of the nature of the water*, but of the presence of the Spirit." Cyprian, speaking of the oil, saith thus: *Sanctificatis elementis jam non propria natura præbet effectum: sed virtus divina potentius operatur*: "It is not *nature*, that giveth effect or force unto the elements, being sanctified; but the *divine power* worketh more mightily." So saith St. Chrysostom: *Petra erat Christus: non enim ipsius petreæ natura aqua scaturiebat:.....sed alia quædam spiritualis Petra omnia operata est, hoc est, Christus*: "The Rock was Christ: for it *was not by the nature of the rock* that the water gushed out; but a certain other spiritual Rock wrought all these things, that is to say, Christ." In like manner the ancient father Origen, speaking of the power and virtue of our Lord's supper, saith thus: *Illud, quod sanctificatur per verbum Dei, et per obsecrationem, non suapte natura sanctificat utentem*: "The thing, that is sanctified by the word of God and by prayer, sanctifieth not him that useth it *by the nature of itself*." By these and other like advertisements these godly fathers meant to withdraw our minds from the outward corruptible creatures to the spiritual and inward

Cyrrill. in Jo-
han. lib. 4.
cap. 12. [iv.
354 b.]

Basil. de Spi-
rit. Sanct.
cap. 15. [iii.
29.]
Οὐκ ἐκ τῆς
φύσεως ἐστὶ
τοῦ ὕδατος.

Cyprian. [Ar-
nold.] de Un-
ctione Chris-
matis. [app.
cxxxiii.]

Chrysost. 1
Cor. hom. 23.
[x. 203.]

Origen. in
Matt. 15. [iii.
499.]

understanding of the sacraments. Therefore Euthymius in the same place saith: *Panis habet similitudinem quam ad corpus, et vinum ad sanguinem*: “The bread hath a certain likeness unto the body, and the wine a certain likeness unto the blood.”

Euthymius
in Matt. xxvi.
[vol. ii. p.
1019.]

M. HARDING.

When it pleased our Saviour Christ at his last supper to institute this blessed sacrament, at which he took bread and wine, and turned them into his body and blood, he would in such wise advance these creatures to a much excellenter condition, as they should lose no whit of their former virtues. ^a For the Son of man came not to destroy, but to save, as St. Augustine saith, is not cause that any thing tend unto not being.....

a Untruth,
fond and
childish. As
though Christ
had died to
save acci-
dents.
Luke ix. 56.

The doctrine
of transub-
stantiation.

Lib. 83. quæ.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

At the last M. Harding hath found some scripture; and that, God wot, full aptly he applieth to serve his purpose. “The Son of man,” saith he, “came not to destroy, but to save:” *ergo*, “The bread and wine lose no whit of their former virtues.”

Hear, I beseech you, M. Harding: what came the Son of man to save? Must we believe he came from heaven to save your *accidents*? Was this the cause of Christ’s coming? Is this the religion ye have learned in Louvain? St. Paul saith: *Nunquid de bubus cura est Deo?* “Hath God any special care for oxen?” Might not one much better say to you, “Hath God any care for your *forms*, for your *shows*, for your empty *accidents*?”

1 Cor. ix. 9.

Perhaps ye will say, I press you over heavily. Ye meant, that Christ came to save bread and wine, and not only *accidents*. Howbeit, so ye cannot say: for by your own doctrine, “the nature and substance of the bread and the wine, by the coming and presence of Christ, is quite abolished, nothing remaining but only the accidents.” But be it, that Christ came to save these creatures, then is your religion much like unto the divinity of the old heretics called the Manichees. Of them St. Augustine writeth thus: *Herbas, atque arbores sic putant vivere, ut ea vitam quæ illis inest] et sentire credant, et dolere, cum la-*

Augustin, ad
Quodvult.
Deum. [viii.
16.]

duntur: nec aliquid inde sine cruciatu eorum quenquam posse vellere: "They think that herbs and trees have life, so far forth that they believe they have sense and feeling, and suffer grief and pain when they be hurt: and that no man can pull or pluck ought from them without their smart." And again he saith: *Nec ova sumunt, quasi et ipsa, cum franguntur, expirent:* "They eat no eggs, imagining, that when they be broken their life or soul passeth from them." Such a careful consideration, it appeareth, ye have for your poor *accidents*.

Ibid. heresis
46. [ibid. p.
15.]

These be mere follies, M. Harding. Christ himself saith, he came to save, not your *accidents*, but *sinner*s: not *bread* and *wine*, but *the thing that was lost*. And will ye tell us, that your *accidents* were lost? or that *bread* and *wine* were such sinful creatures, as could not otherwise be saved than by the blood of Christ?

O, M. Harding, have more reverence to God's word. It is holy: it is it whereby you shall be judged. Have better regard henceforth to that ye write. Christ himself saith: *Filius hominis non venit, ut perdat animas hominum, sed ut servet:* "The Son of man came *not to destroy the souls of men*, but to save them." Here in favour of your case ye have left out *the souls of men*, which was the knot of the whole, and have thrust in *accidents*. And so there must needs appear in you either *gross ignorance*, wherewith you charge others, or *wilful corruption*.

Luke ix. 56.

M. HARDING.

a Untruth, evident and sensible. Read the answer.
b Untruth, trifling and sophistical. For substance is perceived by the senses, although by mean of the accidents.

Seeing then there is a change by all consent, ^a and certain it is that the change is not in the accidents, because we see them remain as they were before, and God deceiveth not our senses in their true and proper object, which is colour, taste, smell, &c.; it must needs be that the change be in substance ^b, which is to sense incomprehensible ⁷⁵.

Change in substance.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

"There is a change in the bread," saith M. Harding, "but not in the accidents thereof: *ergo*, in the substance."

⁷⁵ [This sentence is taken out of its regular order.]

In the like order of reason he might have said, It is not a fern-bush, *ergo*, it is a fox. Ye may not look, M. Harding, to steal thus away with so simple sophisms. This poor shift among children is called *petitio principii*.

Your *minor*, wherein standeth the whole doubt, and which by some authority or shew of reason, one way or other, ye should have proved true, ye have passed slyly over without any manner of proof at all, and presume it only to be true. And so the whole weight hereof standeth not by truth or reason, but hangeth only by presumption.

For what doctor or father ever told you, or made you so certain, that in the bread there is no change touching the *accidents*? Ye say, "your senses tell you, that the accidents remain still as they were before." And the same senses may also tell you, as St. Augustine saith, that the substance of the bread remaineth still as it was before. But will you so suddenly forsake your old lesson? Will you now put this matter in compromise to your senses? How often and how sadly have you told us, "that these be cases of only faith, and that in the judgment hereof both sense and reason must be abandoned?" And have you forgotten that Chrysostom saith: *Nihil sensibile traditum nobis est a Christo. Quæcunque Christus tradidit, insensibilia sunt*: "There is no *sensible thing* delivered unto us by Christ" (in these mysteries)? And again: "Whatsoever things Christ hath given us, they are *unsensible*?" If they be things utterly *unsensible*, how then can they be judged by your senses? Why come ye not forth with the learned doctors and catholic fathers, of whom ye say ye have such plenty? If it be true, as you say, that "there is no change in accident," why is it not proved? If it be false, why is it avouched? Tell us, how long shall we be bound to your bare word?

Verily St. Augustine would have told you, that this change is in *accident*, and not in *substance*. For thus he saith, as it hath been often remembered: *Nisi sacramenta similitudinem quandam haberent earum rerum, quarum sacramenta sunt, omnino sacramenta non essent. Ex hac*

Ad Infantes.
[v. 1103,
1104.]
Quod videtis,
panis est:
quod etiam
oculi renun-
tiant.

Chrysost. in
Matt. hom.
83. [vii. 787.]

Augustin. ad
Bonifacium,
epist. 23. [ii.
267.]

autem similitudine plerumque rerum ipsarum nomina accipiunt: “Unless sacraments had a certain *likeness* of the things of which they be sacraments, then indeed they were no sacraments. And of this *likeness* oftentimes they bear the names of the things themselves, that are represented

In ead. epist.
[ii. 267.]

by the sacraments.” Again he saith: *Secundum quendam modum sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est*:

Augustin.
contra Adi-
mantum, cap.
12. [viii. 124.]

“The sacrament of Christ’s body *after a certain manner* is Christ’s body.” And again: *Non dubitavit Dominus dicere, Hoc est corpus meum, cum daret signum corporis sui*:

“Our Lord doubted not to say, This is my body, when he gave a *token of his body*.” Likewise saith Tertullian, expounding and opening the meaning of Christ’s words:

Tertull. con-
tra Marcion.
lib. 4. [c. 40.
p. 458.]

Hoc est corpus meum, hoc [leg. id] est, Figura corporis mei:

“This is my body, that is to say, *This is a figure of my body*.” You know, M. Harding, that *modus, simile, dissimile, signum*, and *figura*, be in the predicament of *quality*: and therefore pertain to *accident*, and not to *substance*.

So Chrysostom, whereas he amplifieth the change of the bread in the sacrament of thanksgiving, he addeth immediately withal: *Sic etiam in baptismo*: “*Even so is it*,” (that is to say,) “the like change there is in the *water of baptism*.” In these mutations the substance, as well of the bread and wine as of the water, remaineth still: but the *respect*, or *quality*, or *accident*, is changed. And this is it that St. Ambrose said before: *Sunt quæ erant, et in aliud mutantur*: “(In *substance*) they are the same they were before: but (in *accident* or *quality*) they are turned into another thing.”

Chrysost. in
Matt. hom.
83. [vii. 787.]

Ambros. de
Sacrament.
lib. 4. cap. 4.
[iii. 369.]

M. HARDING.

And here we put you in mind of your falsifying of Theodoret’s words, in that ye make him to say in your English, “The mystical signs to remain in their former substance, form, and kind,” where he saith ^a not so, but “in their former substance, figure and shape.” Ye know pardy, there is great difference between the kind of a thing and his shape. The oftener ye use that falsehood, as ye use it very often, the more shall ye be espied to be false teachers, and grow out of credit where truth is loved.

a Untruth,
Even so he
saith. Other-
wise M.
Harding hath
a substance
without
kind.

Theodoret
falsified by
the defender.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

If there be any falsehood or fault herein, by your own confession it is the *interpreter's*, and not the *author's*. You know well, our contention is not of the shape of bread, but of the *substance*. Theodoretus saith: "The bread departeth not from his own nature, but remaineth still in the former substance, figure, and form." Say you as Theodoretus saith: confess plainly, as he doth, "that the substance of the bread remaineth still," and with good leave take the shape unto yourself.

And yet I see no great cause why ye should so mightily cry out, "False teachers, falsehood, falsifying," for that the interpreter hath expounded this Latin word *forma* by this English word *kind*. For as it is proved before by sundry examples more at large, in the ancient fathers these two words, *forma* and *natura*, are often used for one thing. Athanasius saith: *Natura, essentia, genus, forma unum sunt*: "Nature, substance, kind, and form, be all one⁷⁶." Certainly if the very *substance* of the bread should remain, as Theodoretus saith, and yet the *kind* of the bread should not remain, it were a wonder. For as there is no *kind* without *substance*, so is there no *substance* without *kind*.

Before in the second part, chap. i. divis. 1. [supra vol. iv. p. 327.]
Athanas. de Definitionibus. [ii. 244.]

M. HARDING.

The words which ye recite out of St. Augustine's sermon, *Ad Infantes*, we find in Bede upon the tenth chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians⁷⁷. The whole place is this: "This thing which ye see in the altar of God, ye have seen it also in the night past. But what it was, what it meaneth, the sacrament of how great a thing it contained, as yet ye have not heard. That then which ye saw is bread and chalice, which even your eyes tell you. But that which your faith requireth to be instructed of, bread is the body of Christ, the chalice his blood".....If the substance of bread remained, as before consecration, what need had they to hear what it were? For of themselves they might know the things proponed to be bread and wine. But St. Au-

Answer to the place alleged out of St. Augustine.

⁷⁶ [This work, formerly attributed to St. Athanasius, is now considered spurious.]

⁷⁷ [Supra vol. ii. 329, note ²⁶; also S. August. Opp. ed. Ben. v. part. 2. 1103.]

gustine, ye say, calleth that they saw bread and wine. Yea, sir, so it was, so far as their eyes told. But what their faith ought to tell them he instructeth them, saying, "Bread, to wit,..... is the holy body of Christ." To this construction must we stand, by St. Augustine himself so set forth.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

St. Augustine's words are plain enough, howsoever it like you to shadow them with your *glosses*. Thus he saith: *Quod vidistis, panis est, et calix: quod vobis etiam oculi vestri remuntiant*: "The thing that you saw is the bread, and the cup: which thing *your eyes do* report unto you." Where also may be noted, as by the way, that St. Augustine, contrary to your doctrine, M. Harding, referreth the judgment hereof to the report and trial of the senses. And again he saith of himself in the like case: *Vereor ne ipsis sensibus nostris facere videamur injuriam, quando id loquendo suademus, ubi omnes vires, officiumque sermonis facillime superat evidentia veritatis*: "I fear me, we should do wrong unto *our senses*, if we would go about to prove that thing by speaking, wherein the evidence of the truth itself passeth all duty and power of speech."

Augustin. ad
Dardan.
epist. 57. [li.
685.]

Howbeit, St. Augustine saith further: *Quod autem fides vestra postulat instruenda, panis est corpus Christi, calix sanguis*. This objection may be answered by that is said before. These two sayings are both true. Hesychius saith: *Mysterium nostrum simul et panis et caro est*: "Our mystery is both bread and flesh⁷⁷." It is bread in substance and indeed: it is also the *body of Christ*, not in substance, but in a *mystery*. Your own *Gloss* saith, as it is before alleged: *Dicitur corpus Christi, sed improprie:ut sit sensus, Vocatur corpus Christi, id est, significat corpus Christi*: "It is called the body of Christ, but *unproperly*, or not in due and usual form of speech. The meaning thereof may be this: It is called Christ's body, that is to say, *It signifieth Christ's body*."

Hesych. in
Levit. lib. 2.
cap. 8. [fol.
49. c.]

De Cons. dist.
2. Hoc est
quod. In
Glossa.

In a sacrament we must behold, not only the outward

⁷⁷ [Hesych. in Levit. "... ut nos intelligamus illud ab eo mysterium dici, quod simul panis

"et caro est, sicut corpus Christi, panis veri, qui de cœlo descendit."]

element, but also the thing itself, whereof it is a sacrament.

St. Augustine saith : *Si ad ipsas res visibiles quibus sacramenta tractantur, animum conferamus, quis nesciat eas esse corruptibiles ? si autem ad id quod per illas (res) agitur, quis non videat, non posse corrumpi ?* “ If we consider the visible creatures, wherein the sacraments are ministered, who knoweth not, they be *things corruptible* ? but if we consider the thing that is wrought thereby, who seeth not, *it cannot be corrupted ?*”

Augustin. de Baptis. contra Donatist. lib. 3. cap. 10. [ix. 113.]

And in the same place before alleged St. Augustine fully expoundeth his own meaning, in what sense the *bread* may be called the *body of Christ*. These be his words : *Christus levavit corpus suum in cælum, unde venturus est, ut judicet vivos et mortuos. Ibi est modo sedens ad dextram Patris. Quomodo est panis corpus ejus ? et calix, vel quod habet calix, quomodo est sanguis ejus ? Ista, fratres, ideo dicuntur sacramenta, quia in eis aliud videtur, aliud intelligitur :* “ Christ hath lifted up his body into heaven, from whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. There is he now sitting at the right hand of the Father. *How then is the bread his body ?* and the cup, or that is in the cup, how is it his blood ?” His answer is this : “ O my brethren, these be called sacraments, for that in them *one thing is seen, and another thing is understood.*”

Augustin. in Serm. ad Infant. [v. pt. 2. 1104.]

Thus therefore the thing that we see with our bodily eyes is the very *nature and substance of bread* : but the thing that we see with our faith is the very *natural body of Christ* sitting in heaven, and represented unto us in the mysteries.

Now I beseech thee, good Christian reader, mark what descant M. Harding playeth upon these words. St. Augustine saith : “ Believe the judgment of your eyes :” M. Harding saith : “ Senses be deceitful, believe not the judgment of your eyes.” St. Augustine saith : “ The thing that you see is bread :” M. Harding saith : “ It is not so : it is no bread.” So handsomely this Gloss groweth to the text.

THE APOLOGY.

[Origen. in
Matt. xv. tom.
iii. 499.]

Or that which Origen saith: The bread which is sanctified by the word of God, as touching the material substance thereof, goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the privy. [Vol. iv. p. 23.]

M. HARDING.

a Untruth.
For we have
corrupted
neither word
nor sentence.

To that ma-
terial :

A proper
translation.

b Untruth.
For he nam-
eth it bread

[βρῶμα],
seven times
in one place.

c Untruth,
unless ye will
rather call it
the material
accident.

d Untruth.
For in the
same place
he saith, *Nec
materialia
panis.*

e Untruth,
vain and void
of sense. For
what acci-
dents be
voided forth?

In alleging Origen, sir defender, ye play your accustomed false play, ^a corrupting his sentence, and falsifying his words. For they be not as you recite them, but thus: *Ille cibus qui sanctificatur per verbum Dei, perque obsecrationem, juxta id quod habet materiale, in ventrem abit, et in secessum ejicitur*: "That meat which is consecrated by the word of God, and by prayer, according to that material which it hath, it goeth into the belly, and is voided forth into the privy." Here neither nameth he ^b bread as you do, (to cause the people to think it is but very bread,) but meat. And that you have in your Latin, *Quod quidem ad materiam attinet*: which is by your interpreter, "As touching the material substance thereof," ^c it is not Origen's, but your own forged stuff, to deceive the ignorant withal, to the end they might be moved, by your false handling of that doctor, to believe the matter and substance of very bread to remain. He speaketh not of the ^d matter of bread, but of that which is material in this sacrament, meaning the accidents or qualities remaining after consecration, which be material, but not the matter itself of bread (as matter is taken for the one part of a perfect substance), ^e and the same accidents be voided forth, as Origen had good cause by occasion of Christ's word to declare, you had none to record the same. But it liked your filthy spirit with vile words to bring that holy mystery and blessed sacrament into contempt. Wherein ye do the devil, author of all heresies, the greatest service that may be devised.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

"Heresies," "false play," "falsehood," "falsifying," "vile words," "filthy spirits," are now become M. Harding's ordinary and usual eloquence. Here "have we corrupted," as he saith, "and belied Origen," for that we place this word *panis* instead of *cibus*: and for that we say, *panis quod ad materiam attinet*, instead of these words, *cibus juxta id quod habet materiale*. "This," saith M. Harding, "is forged stuff:" this is "horrible and shameful corruption to deceive the ignorant." He that knew not

M. Harding's modesty and manner of writing, would think these tragical terms should bear some weight. For sober men seldom use thus to cry without some cause. Touching these words, *cibus*, *panis*, *materiale*, *materia*, if there be any thing that may mislike him, it shall be lawful for him to reform the same, and to use either the one word or the other at his pleasure. We stand only upon the substance of matter, and seek no such wanton advantages by shift of words.

Nevertheless, Origen himself, as it appeareth, was not so dangerous in the case. For whereas M. Harding so sharply overlooketh us for once using this word *panis* instead of *cibus*, Origen himself useth the same word *panis*, seven times together in the selfsame place without reproof: like as St. Paul also five times⁷⁷ in one place calleth it *panis*: and St. Cyril calleth the portions thereof, *fragmenta panis*: "pieces of bread:" and yet were none of these ever condemned therefore as *corrupters* and *falsifiers*.

Cyrrill. in
Johan. lib. 4.
cap. 14. [*al.*
cap. 2. tom.
iv. p. 360.]

But I beseech you, M. Harding, if this word *cibus*, "meat," which Origen useth, and you seem to allow, were not *bread*, what kind of *meat* then will you call it? *Flesh*, *fish*, or *fruit*, I trow it was not. You say, Origen meant thereby your *forms*, and *accidents*, and *shows* of bread. Now verily this was but a quasi *meat*: and I marvel, that ever any wise man would call it *meat*. Irenæus saith: "Of the same meat is increased, and consisteth the substance of our flesh." And Rabanus saith: *Sacramentum in alimentum corporis redigitur*: "The sacrament (which is the bread) is turned into our *bodily nourishment*." *Shows* and *accidents* are but a simple food to increase the substance of our bodies.

Irenæus, lib.
5. cap. 4. [p.
294.]

Angetur, et
consistit
carnis nostræ
substantia.

Raban. Mau-
rus, [de Cler.
Inst.] lib. 1.
cap. 31. [tom.
vi. p. 11.]

Touching the other foul fault, M. Harding saith, "his accidents and qualities be things material: but the matter itself," he saith, "they be not." But where learned he this strange doctrine? what divine, what philosopher, what logician, what sophister, what wise man ever taught him thus to say? who ever said that *accidents are things material*? It is well known, that *materia* evermore is *substantia*, and never otherwise. Therefore M. Harding

⁷⁷ [The word "*panis*" occurs *four* times in 1 Cor. xi.]

might as easily have said, *accidents be things substantial*. Certainly *accidents* and *qualities* be *accidentales formæ*, and in the schools are called things *formal*: which are as far from things *material*, as fire from water. Notwithstanding, these men have power to make of *accidents*, ‘*substance* :’ of *forms*, ‘*matters* :’ of things *formal*, things ‘*material* :’ and of one contrary, to make another: and all this only of themselves, without any manner other authority.

M. Harding saith, “that the meat whereof Origen speaketh is a *material*,” (for this is the light and clearness of his eloquence,) “but not *materia* :” and by this pretty distinction he thinketh the whole matter is fully discharged. And amongst the ignorant that cannot judge, perhaps he may seem to say somewhat. But Origen himself, that best understood his own meaning, calleth the same meat, in the same place, by express and plain words, not only a *thing material*, or a *material*, as M. Harding rather delighteth to call it, but also the very *matter of bread itself*. His words be these: *Nec materia panis, sed super illum dictus sermo est, qui prodest non indigne Domino comedenti*: “It is not the matter of the bread, but the word spoken over it, that profiteth him that eateth not unworthily for the Lord⁷⁸.” Now judge thou indifferently, gentle reader, how just causes M. Harding had to move these tragedies.

Further he saith: “It liked our filthy spirit with vile words to bring the holy mysteries into contempt, and therein we do the devil great service.” O, M. Harding, some other speech would better become a man of your gravity. Such liquor seldom floweth from the Spirit of God. We neither increase, nor diminish, nor any way alter the words of Origen, but lay them forth plainly and simply as we find them. For thus he writeth:.....*Ille cibus qui sanctificatur per verbum Dei, et per obsecrationem, juxta id quod habet materiale, in ventrem abit, et in secessum ejicitur. Ceterum juxta precationem quæ illi accessit, pro portione fidei fit utilis*.....: “The meat that is sanctified by the word of God, and by prayer, according to that material part that is

Origen. in
Matt. xv.
[iii. 500.]

[Origen. in
Matt. xv. iii.
499. ed. 1572.
p. 27.]

⁷⁸ [Origen. καὶ οὐχ ἡ ὕλη τοῦ λόγος ἐστὶν ὁ ὠφελῶν τὸν μὴ ἀνα-
ἀρτοῦ, ἀλλ’ ὁ ἐπ’ αὐτῷ εἰρημένος ξίως τοῦ Κυρίου ἐσθίοντα αὐτόν.]

in it, *passeth into the belly, and so forth into the privy,*" &c.⁷⁹ If there be any *filthiness* or *villainy* herein, it is this ancient father's, whom ye ought not so uncourteously to revile for uncleanness of spirit: it is not ours.

Howbeit, this is not Origen's only judgment, but the general and agreeable doctrine of all others the catholic fathers. And to allege one instead of many, St. Augustine saith, as he is before alleged: *Si ad res ipsas quibus sacramenta tractantur animum conferamus, quis nesciat eas esse corruptibiles? si ad id quod per illas (res) agitur, quis non videat non posse corrumpi?* "If we consider the things themselves wherein the sacraments be ministered, who knoweth not, that they be *things corruptible?* but if we consider the thing that is wrought thereby, who seeth not, that it *cannot be corrupted?*" The holy fathers speak not thus of Christ's body, but of the bread, which is the sacrament of Christ's body. So saith St. Ambrose: *Non iste panis qui vadit in corpus: sed panis vitæ æternæ, qui animæ nostræ substantiam fulcit:* (the bread that I mean is) "not *this bread*" (of the sacrament) "*that passeth into the body:* but the bread of everlasting life, that maintaineth the substance of the soul."

Augustin. de Baptism. contra Donatist. lib. 3. cap. 10. [ix. 113.]

De Con. dist. 2. Non iste.

Now if there were such *filthiness*, as you have imagined, in the holy learned bishops and doctors of the church, for uttering these and other like words of the corruptible creatures of bread and wine, what clean spirit then is there in them, that speak so filthily of *Christ's body itself*, being now uncorruptible and glorious, at the right hand of the Father? Hereof I had occasion to speak somewhat in my former Reply.

In art. 23. [Supra vol. iii. p. 455.]

Alexander of Hales saith: *Quidam dicunt, ubicunque ponantur species, sive in mundo loco, sive in immundo, sive in ventrem muris, ibi est corpus Christi:* "Some say, wheresoever the *forms* or *accidents* be laid, whether the place be clean or unclean, yea although it be in the *mouse's belly*, yet there is *the body of Christ.*" Again he saith: *Si* [Ibid.]

Alex. Halen. par. 4. quest. 45. mem. 1. [art. 2.]

⁷⁹ [Τὸ ἁγιαζόμενον βρῶμα διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ καὶ ἐντεύξεως, κατ' αὐτὸ μὲν τὸ ὑλικὸν εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν χωρεῖ, καὶ εἰς ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκβάλλεται κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐπιγιγνομένην εὐχὴν κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως, ὡφελιμον γίνεταί. . . .]

canis vel porcus deglutiret hostiam consecratam integram, non video quare corpus Domini non simul trajiceretur in ventrem canis, vel porci: “If a *dog* or *hog* should swallow down the host consecrate being whole, I see no cause to the contrary, but the *body of Christ* may pass withal into the *belly of the dog, or of the hog*.”

Likewise your own Clemens, whom ye so often call “the apostles’ fellow,” writeth thus: *Ne murium stercora inter fragmenta Dominicæ portionis appareant*: “Let not mice dung be found among the fragments or pieces of the Lord’s portion.” By which *portion* he meaneth the sacrament. Your own catholic allowed Gloss saith: *Corpus Christi potest evomi*: “The body of Christ may be vomited up again.”

† Clemens.
epist. 2.
[Crabb. l. 42.]

De Con. dist.
2. Si quis.
In Glossa.
[l. in marg.]

It abhorreth my heart to utter these words: they be so horrible and full of filth. Yet this, M. Harding, is your own doctrine: this is your *spirit*: this is it, that ye have so long maintained with fire and sword. By such *unclean and uncivil speech*, ye bring Christ’s body itself into contempt and loathsomeness in the hearts of the people.

But, that you may the better see the consent and certainty of your own doctrine, whereas you are well content to expound these words of Origen, as undoubtedly spoken of the sacrament of Christ’s body, your instructor and master doctor Gardiner telleth you, that the same words pertain nothing at all unto the sacrament: and yet unto what thing else they should pertain, it seemeth by the doubtfulness of his answer, he was never well resolved.

Marc. Anton.
Constantinus
ad objectum
166.

His words be these: *Non de eucharistia loquitur Origenes, sed de pane sanctificato per verbum Dei, et orationem, quem communiter manducamus: vel de eo qui solebat dari catechumenis, de quo Augustinus*: “Origen speaketh not” (these words) “of the sacrament: but either of the bread that is sanctified by our Lord’s word, and by prayer, which we commonly use to eat: or else he speaketh of the bread that was given to the novices, called *catechumeni*, whereof St. Augustine speaketh.” If this tale be true, then is yours untrue, M. Harding, and all your long commentary of *forms* and *accidents* is but in vain. It were good ye took a day, that ye may be better agreed upon that ye tell us.

And whereas, to shift the matter, ye put your poor *spiritual forms* and *holy accidents* to all the pains to pass into the belly, and so forth into the draught, and avouch the same in such sober wise, as if ye partly understood what ye said, it may please you to understand, that, by the judgment of your own schoolfellows the *canonists*, ye are foully deceived. For thus they determine the matter quite against you : *Species illæ aliis cibis non permiscentur : non enim in stomachum descendant : quare per secessum non emittuntur* : “ These forms or accidents are not mingled with other meats. For they go not down into the stomach : and therefore they pass not into the privy.” Now, M. Harding, if the bread be utterly consumed, and have no being at all, and if the *accidents* pass not into the privy, what other thing else remaineth there to pass that way ? It is a strange kind of passage, whereas is nothing to pass.

De Con. dist.
2. Trib. gra-
dib. In
Glossa.

Hereby it may appear, that either the Gloss, or M. Harding, is in error. But the Gloss is allowed, and counted catholic : therefore the error must be M. Harding's. Howbeit, to say the truth, M. Harding and his Gloss too are both in error.

THE APOLOGY.

Or that which Christ himself said, not only after the blessing of the cup, but also after he had ministered the communion : “ I will drink no more of this fruit of the vine.” It is well known that the fruit of the vine is wine, and not blood.

[Vol. iv. p.
23.]

[Matt. xxvi.
2].

M. HARDING.

.....⁷⁹ “ Christ,” say they, “ himself said, not only after the blessing of the cup, but after he had ministered the communion, ‘ I will drink no more of this fruit of the vine.’ ” Hereunto they add of their own heads, “ ^a It is well known that the fruit of the vine is wine, and not blood.” By this they would signify, that in the chalice we have not Christ's blood, as himself said, but mere wine, as against Christ they labour to persuade.....

^a Untruth.
For these be
St. Chrysos-
tom's words,
and not ours.

⁷⁹ [This answer of Harding's is partly because what is omitted has much abridged, partly because of the amplification of his writing, been already answered by bishop Jewel again and again.]

But we say, that those words ("I will not drink from hence-^{Luke xxii. 18.} forth of this generation of the vine") either were spoken ^b only before the communion, ^c or only after, ^d or in both times. If they were spoken before communion, (which opinion is the more probable,) it is very clearly proved by them, that wine remaineth not, as it shall hereafter be deduced.....

^e M. Harding refuseth St. Matthew's and St. Mark's order.

^f As by way of a sacrament. Otherwise it is untrue.

For these causes it may well be said, that we should rather follow the order of Luke, who witnesseth that Christ spake these words before his maundy, ^e than Matthew and Mark, who tell it as spoken after. Secondly, the order of Luke is confirmed by the circumstance of the things that he describeth, more than the other evangelists..... Now because in the chalice of the old law there was certainly not blood, but wine, (whereas Christ teacheth, that in his chalice his own blood is ^f contained,) let the discreet reader judge, whether we must not rather think that these words of Christ, "I will not from henceforth drink of this generation of the vine," do not rather pertain to the cup of the old law, (as Luke placeth them,) than to the chalice of Christ after the consecration, whereof Matthew and Mark rehearse them.....

^g A weighty point of salvation: yet M. Harding himself by his confession understandeth it not.

^h Untruth, vain and arrogant.

Fourthly and lastly, when Matthew and Mark rehearse that Christ said, "he would not from thenceforth drink of that generation of the vine," they both, in much like sort of speaking, add thereunto these words (which in the Apology were guilefully left out): "until that day, when I will drink it new with you in the kingdom of God my Father." If Christ spake of a new drinking which is to come, by likelihood the drinking past is old..... What exclamation would be sufficient to express, that in this ^g weighty point of salvation our English clergy are content ^h to blind the people, the right worshipful, yea the honourable of our country, in so vile a sort, that after many fathers' words misreported, and wrongfully wrested, they doubt not to attempt the same in Christ's own sayings, and in those sayings of his which evidently prove the contrary?

But now let us grant of our free liberality, contrary to so many good and strong reasons, that Christ said after consecration, "I will not from henceforth drink of this generation of the vine, until the kingdom of God come," then it must be further understood, that the kingdom of God is taken in scripture sometime for the present state of the church after Christ's resurrection in this world, according to that is said oftentimes in scripture, "The kingdom of God draweth nigh:" sometimes also for the joy of heaven, as when Christ saith, "I dispose for you a kingdom, as my Father hath disposed for me, that ye may eat and drink at my table," &c. Now if we take these words of Christ spoken before consecration, it is not inconvenient to understand them of either of both kingdoms: that is to say, of the kingdom of resurrection, or of glory, as Chrysostom and other do witness, because both were to come at that time. But if we take them spoken after consecration, as we rather upon confidence of the

Matt. xxvi.

29.

Mark xiv. 25.

New drinking.

The kingdom of God taken two ways.

Matt. iii. 2.

truth than for necessity at this time do grant, then these words
 Luke xxii. 18. ("until the kingdom of God come") are to be meant only of
 the kingdom of glory. For these holy mysteries belong to the
 kingdom of Christ's resurrection and ascension. Neither were
 they practised by the apostles in the church of Christ, until the
 Holy Ghost came down upon them.....

And so the newness of it there, is fruition of it, not under the
 forms of bread and wine, ⁱas we have it now, but face to face ⁱUntruth,
 without all figure and form. Then it is to be noted that Christ ^{grounded}
 said not, "I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine," but, ^{upon a mere}
 "I will not from henceforth drink of this generation of the vine:
 of this I say, whereof now I have drunken, ^kwhich is" (under ^kUntruth,
 the form of wine) "my blood, which am the true vine." For ^{threat}
 whereas this Apology saith, ("It is well known that the fruit ^{upon Christ}
 of the vine is wine, and not blood,") it seemeth to declare that ^{himself.}

the authors thereof are ignorant in the holy scriptures, where
^lthey might have found the fruit of some vine to be called blood. ^lA foud

Gen. xlix. 11. "He shall wash his robe in wine, and his cloak in the blood of ^{cavil. For we}
 a grape." Lo, a grape hath his blood: a grape is the fruit of ^{speak only of}
 the vine: and therefore it is not well known that the fruit of ^{a natural}
 the vine is not blood. The Holy Ghost did in these words of Jacob ^{vine.}

In 1 Cor. x. ^mAs in a
 [x. 212.] And now is it no wonder if we expound the word (vine) mysti- ^{mystery.}
 cally..... ^{Otherwise it}
 is untrue.

O what strength truth hath! how plainly she dareth to shew
 her face, not nipping the scriptures, nor mis-Englishing them,
 nor dissembling any jot that may seem to make against her!

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Mark, gentle reader, how mightily M. Harding wrastleth,
 and what pains he taketh to draw this place to his
 purpose. First he assureth us for certain, "that Christ ¹
 spake these words *before* the consecration, and that there-
 fore they pertain nothing to the sacrament." Nevertheless,
 afterward he granteth, as he saith, *of his free liberality*,
 "that Christ spake the same words *after* the consecration: ²
 and that they pertain specially to the sacrament." And
 yet again, upon further affiance and boldness of the cause,
 he seemeth to say, "it may be that Christ spake the same ³
 words at both times:" that is, as well *after* the consecra-
 tion as *before*.

Again he saith: "St. Luke's rehearsal is more likely ⁴

than St. Matthew's, for that St. Luke writeth each thing in order : and St. Matthew out of order."

5 Again : "One cup is first the wine of the old testament:" and immediately after, "the same cup is the wine of the new testament."

6 Again : *the kingdom of God* sometime is the state of the
7 church, sometime it is the state of glory. Again : *the fruit of the grape* sometime is very natural wine, sometime it is the very blood of Christ. Notwithstanding, Stephen Gardiner saith, that neither the natural wine, nor Christ's very blood, but the accidents and forms are the fruits of the vine. Yet again he saith : "Christ drank his own very blood at the supper : and even now himself drinketh the same his own blood in the kingdom of heaven⁸⁰."

Anton. Constantius ad
objectum 27.

In the end M. Harding, after he hath well wandered, and walked himself, both before and after : in order, and out of order : this way, and that way : with the old cup, and with the new : and hath well stayed himself by conjectures and likelihoods : at the last he bloweth up the triumph with a jolly courage, and crieth out with an end
8 of an old song : "O what strength truth hath, and how plainly she dareth to shew her face!"

Before.

Here by the way a man might demand of M. Harding, notwithstanding the great confidence he pretendeth to have in his cause : If Christ spake these words *before the consecration* of the very natural wine of the grape, and of the ceremonial cup of the old law, how drank he then afterward of the same natural wine of the grape, after a new sort? or how was the same natural wine *fulfilled in the kingdom of God*? If Christ spake the same words *after the consecration*, the substance of wine by these men's phantasy being utterly abolished, and nothing there remaining, but only the accidents, how was it then the *fruit or generation of the vine*? Thus howsoever he take it, either *before* or *after*, he shall hardly be able to shift his hands.

After.

⁸⁰ [Gardiner seems to be quoting Eucherius, not giving his own opinion. "Eucherius sic scribit, "Regnum Dei ecclesia est, in quo

"quotidie bibit sanguinem suum
"Christus per sanctos suos, tam-
"quam caput in membris suis."]

But to leave these unfruitful guesses until M. Harding have better agreed with himself upon some certainty, we say that *the cup of blessing*, which Christ calleth *the cup of the new testament*, notwithstanding it were made in a mystery the sacrament of Christ's blood, yet in *nature* and *substance* was very wine still, and, as Christ himself calleth it, "*the very fruit and generation of the grape*," as it was before.

The words of the evangelist St. Matthew are very plain : "He took the cup : and when he had given thanks, he gave it them, saying, Drink ye all of it : for this is my blood of the new testament, that is shed for many for the remission of sins. I say unto you, that I will not drink henceforth of *this fruit of the vine*, until that day when I shall drink it new with you in the kingdom of my Father." To avoid the manifest truth of this rehearsal, M. Harding saith : "St. Matthew uttered one thing for another : the latter for the former : the cup consecrate for the cup unconsecrate : and placed his matters out of order." And by this poor shift he thinketh the plain story of the gospel is fully answered.

But let us see, what the learned fathers have judged and written in this behalf. So shall the weight of these conjectural guesses, and the *face* of M. Harding's *truth*, which he so much magnifieth without cause, the better appear. Clemens Alexandrinus hereof writeth thus : *Quod vinum esset, quod benedictum est, Christus ostendit, dicens discipulis, Non bibam ex fructu vitis hujus, donec bibero ipsum vobiscum in regno Patris mei* : "That *it was wine* that was blessed" (at the supper), "Christ himself shewed his disciples, saying, '*I will no more drink of the fruit of this vine*, until I shall drink it with you in the kingdom of my Father⁸¹.'"

St. Basil saith : *Fructus terræ genituras et genimina, non natos appellamus : non enim bibam, inquit, de genimine vitis hujus* : "We call the fruits of the earth, the *generations* or *springs* of the earth : but the *children* of the earth we do not call them. For so saith Christ : '*I will no more drink*

⁸¹ [Clem. Alex. ὅτι δὲ οἶνος ἦν τοὺς μαθητὰς λέγων· οὐ μὴ πῖω ἐκ τοῦ ἐὺλογηθέν, ἀπέδειξε πάλιν, πρὸς τοῦ γεννήματος κ. τ. λ.]

Clemens in
Pedagogo,
lib. 2. cap. 2.
[l. 186.]

Basil. contra
Eunom. lib.
2. [l. 244.]

of the generation of this vine.’” Here the wine that Christ had blessed is called by St. Basil, after the time of consecration, not only the *generation* of the vine, but also the *fruit of the earth*. Whatsoever it shall please M. Harding to think of the sense hereof, he must needs confess the

Cyprian, lib.
1. epist. 6.
[p. 153.]

words are very plain. Likewise saith St. Cyprian: *Dominus sanguinem suum vinum appellavit, de botris et acinis plurimis expressum, atque in vinum coactum*: “The wine pressed out of clusters and many grapes, and so made wine,

Augustin. de
Ecclesiast.
Dogmatib.
cap. 75. [viii.
app. p. 80.]

our Lord called his blood.” St. Augustine saith: *Et vinum fuit in redemptionis nostræ mysterio, cum Dominus diceret, Non bibam amodo de hoc genimine vitis*: “There was wine in the mystery or sacrament of our redemption, when our Lord said, ‘I will no more drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine’⁸¹.”

Here note thou, good reader, how handsomely St. Augustine and M. Harding agree together. St. Augustine saith plainly, “*It was the sacrament*.” M. Harding saith plainly, “*It was not the sacrament*.” St. Augustine saith: “These words were spoken after the consecration:” M. Harding findeth fault with St. Matthew’s order, and saith: “*They were spoken before the consecration*.” St. Augustine, following the plain words of Christ, saith: “*It was wine*.” M. Harding, following his own words, against both St. Augustine and Christ too, saith undoubtedly: “*It was no wine*.”

Augustin.
Quest. E-
vangelicar.
lib. 1. cap.
43. [iii. pt. 2.
248.]

Again St. Augustine saith: *Dominus per vini sacramentum, commendat sanguinem suum. Quid enim aliud, novum vinum, nisi immortalitatem renovandorum* [al. *renovatorum*] *corporum intelligere debemus?* “Our Lord by the sacrament” (not of forms or accidents, but) “*of wine*, commendeth unto us his blood. For what other thing may we understand the *new wine to be*, but the immortality of our bodies that shall be renewed?” St. Chrysostom saith: *Cum Dominus hoc mysterium traderet, vinum tradidit. Et jam post resurrectionem sine mysteriis in simplici mensa vino usus est. Ex genimine, ait, vitis: quæ certe vinum, non aquam producit*: “Our Lord when he delivered this

Chrysost. in
Matt. hom.
83. [vii. 784.]

⁸¹ [Augustin. de Eccl. Dogm. it has been attributed by some to This work is not by St. Augustine: Gennadius, A. D. 492.]

mystery, *delivered*" (not accidents, but) "*wine*. And after his resurrection, being at a plain table without the mysteries, *he used wine*. For so he saith: '*Of the fruit of the vine: which vine surely beareth, not water, but wine.*'"

H. Harding saith: "Whosoever expoundeth these words as spoken of the mysteries, beliieth both the holy fathers and Christ himself." St. Chrysostom expoundeth the same words, *as spoken of the mysteries*, and to that purpose applieth the words of Christ. Therefore by M. Harding's conclusion, "he beliieth both the holy fathers, and Christ himself."

In like manner St. Hierom saith: (*Christus*) *in typo sanguinis sui non obtulit aquam, sed vinum*: "Christ, in the signification of his blood, offered not water, but wine." By these few, I trust, it may easily appear to the indifferent reader, how just cause M. Harding had thus to proclaim, and publish *the face*, as he saith, *of his truth*: and with such courage and countenance to cry out, *that we have wilfully corrupted the words of Christ*.

M. Harding saith further: "These defenders add of their own heads, *It is well known, that the fruit of the vine is wine, and not blood.*" I thought M. Harding would not have picked so simple a quarrel to these words, of whose head soever they had been added. For, I trow, he hath but seldom heard or seen, that a natural vine hath borne natural blood. Howbeit, these words proceeded not altogether of our own heads. St. Chrysostom also of his head uttereth the same. For thus he writeth: *Ex genimine vitis: quæ certe vinum producit, non aquam*: "Of the fruit of the vine: which vine verily bringeth forth, not water, but wine." St. Cyprian saith: *Invenimus.....vinum fuisse, quod Dominus sanguinem suum dixit*: "We find it was wine that our Lord called his blood." And Dionysius, Lyra, and other like doctors of M. Harding's own side, say: *De hoc genimine vitis: id est, de vino, quod generatur in vinea*: "Of this fruit of the vine: that is to say, Of the wine that groweth of the vine."

Again, M. Harding saith: "It is to be noted, that Christ said not, 'I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine:'"

Hieron. ad-
versus Jovi-
nian. lib. 2.
p. 74. tom. ii.
[iv. pt. 2.
193.]

Chrysost. in
Matt. hom.
83. [vii. 784.]

Cyprian. lib.
2. epist. 3.
[pp. 106,
107.]

Dionysius
[Carthus.],
et Lyra, in
Matt. cap.
26. [v. 428.]

but, 'I will not from henceforth drink of this generation of the vine:.' as if there were some marvellous great difference between these two words, *fruit* and *generation*. "And this thing," he saith, "is well worthy to be noted." Verily, the difference between these two words is as great, as is the difference between *ensis* and *gladius*, or *liber* and *codex*: between which words, sound only excepted, it is hard to discern, whether is other. M. Harding saith: "It is to be noted, that Christ said not, 'I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine.'" Yet St. Hilary saith:*Bibentes ex vitis istius fructu*.....: "Drinking of the *fruit* of this vine." If these words, as being doubtfully spoken, may be shifted into some other sense: yet Clemens Alexandrinus, as he is before alleged, and as he is translated by Gentianus Hervetus, saith plainly: *Non bibam de hoc fructu vitis* [*.fructu hujus vitis*]: "I will no more drink of *this fruit* of the vine." And St. Cyprian somewhat in plainer wise saith: *Non bibam ex ista creatura vitis*: "I will no more drink of this *creature* of the vine." Therefore, I think, M. Harding himself will say, This note was not greatly worth the noting.

Hilarius in
Matt. can.
30. [p. 740.]

[Supr. p.
133.]
Clemens in
Paedagog. lib.
2. cap. 2. [i.
186, et ed.
Basil. fol. 33
a.]

Cyprian. lib.
2. epist. 3.
[p. 106.]

Yet farther he saith: "These defenders seem to be ignorant of the holy scriptures: where they might have found the fruit of some vine to be called *blood*. For Jacob said of Christ, 'He shall wash his robe in wine, and his cloak in the blood of a grape.'" It is a hard shift, M. Harding, so suddenly to convey the matter from ordinary use of speech, unto an allegory. We speak of a *natural growing vine*, which we say beareth not blood, but only wine. But, as touching that ye say, Christ is sometimes called a *vine* in the holy scriptures, it is only an allegory, or a figure of speech. And in that sort, he is called also sometimes a *lamb*, and sometimes a *rock*. For although Christ for certain properties may be resembled unto a vine, yet is he not therefore verily and indeed a *natural growing vine*: no more than he is a *natural lamb*, yeaned of a ewe, or a *natural growing rock*. Therefore it was great violence, thus to force the words of the scriptures to this purpose. Otherwise, by the like phrase of speech one saith: *Lachryma*

est quidam animæ sanguis: “A tear is a certain blood of the soul.” And St. Augustine saith: *Vident sanguinem corporum: animarum sanguinem non vident*: “They see the blood of the bodies, but the blood of the souls they see not.” Another called wine, *Terræ sanguinem*: “The blood of the earth.” Yet may not M. Harding therefore say, that either the *soul of man*, or the *mould of the earth*, indeed hath natural and real and very blood. These be only certain figures and forms of speech. But Christ, when he said, “I will no more drink of this *fruit* of the vine,” spake plainly and simply, and without figure. And therefore Chrysostom saith, as it is alleged before, *Ex genimine vitis: quæ certe vinum producit, non aquam*: “Of the *fruit* of the vine: which vine verily bringeth forth, not water, but wine.” But Chrysostom saith: “The wine that was shed from Christ’s body, that is to say, the blood of Christ is in the cup.” This is true, as in a mystery, or by a figure of speech: because Christ’s blood is represented in the cup. Otherwise, if we speak simply and plainly, and without figure, Chrysostom saith: *In vasis sanctificatis non est ipsum corpus Christi: sed mysterium corporis ejus continetur*: “In the sanctified vessels, there is *not the very body of Christ indeed*: but a mystery of that body is therein contained.”

Androcides
[ap. Plin. lib.
14. cap. 5.]

Chrysost. in
Matt. hom.
83. [vil. 784.]

Chrysost.
1 Cor. x.
hom. 24.
[x. 212.]

Chrysost. in
Opere Imp.
hom. 11. [vi.
app. 63.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 14. Divis. 1.

[Vol. iv. p.
23.]

And in speaking thus, we mean not to abase the Lord’s supper, or to teach, that it is but a cold ceremony only, and nothing to be wrought therein (as many falsely slander us we teach). For we affirm, that Christ doth truly and presently give [*origin. exhibit*] himself wholly in his sacraments: in *baptism*, that we may put him on: and in his *supper*, that we may eat him by faith and spirit, and may have everlasting life by his cross and blood. And we say not, this is done slightly or coldly, but effectually and truly. For, although we do not touch the body of Christ with teeth and mouth, yet we hold

him fast, and eat him by faith, by understanding, and by spirit. And it is no vain faith, that comprehendeth Christ: neither is it received with cold devotion, that is received with understanding, faith, and spirit. For Christ himself altogether is so offered, and given us in these mysteries, that we may certainly know we be *flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bones*: and that *Christ continueth in us, and we in him*.

M. HARDING.

a Untruths two together, For we never called it either baker's bread, or only figure.

b Untruth. For Christ's death is as present as his body.

c Whatsoever corruptible creature is honoured as God, it is an idol.

d Untruth, standing in wrong exposition. For Chrysostom saith: *Ascende ad cali portas: imo non cali, sed cali calorum.*

e Untruth, grounded upon a dream. No learned doctor ever said thus.

It is easy to be perceived, who abaseth more our Lord's supper, whether ye, that teach it to be very ^a baker's bread and wine, with the ^a only figure of Christ's body and blood, or we, who believe it to be his true body and blood, with the only forms of bread and wine. (*Of which forms, neither Christ nor his apostles ever told us one word*⁸².) Whether ye, that will have it a figure of Christ's whole body absent, or we, who will have Christ's body present indeed, with a figure of his death, which ^b death is absent only. Whether ye, that call it an ^c idol when it is worshipped, or we, that do according to our duty adore it, because that royal body, (as Chrysostom saith,) which is set before us ^d to be seen now in earth, is worthy of the most high honour. But whether of those two is the colder ceremony and more simple supper, to have bread and wine with a sign only of flesh and blood, or to have real flesh and blood with such forms of bread and wine, as ^e by the power of God do no less bodily nourish us, than the substance itself would have done: we doubt not of wise men's judgment. Ye have your carnal banquets fat and full enough of the best flesh, and it is with you superstitious to eat dry and Lenten meats. But ye will have your spiritual banquets so lean and carrion, as a man may well discern whether ye have more phantasy to your flesh or to your spirit.

Ye write, that many falsely slander you, saying that ye teach nothing to be wrought in the Lord's supper, whereas ye affirm, that Christ doth truly and presently give his own self in his supper, that we may eat him by faith and spirit. And other work in the Lord's supper ye shew none. And this which ye shew a man may doubt, whether it be a thing wrought in the Lord's supper, or no. Well may ye say, that it is a thing wrought in them which come to the supper: but that it is wrought in the supper itself, ye shew it not: the supper being that which is called *cæna*, to wit, the meat received, not *cænatio*, which is the act of supping. For sith that supper is nothing else

By whom is our Lord's supper more abased, by the defenders, or by the catholics?

The sacramentaries teach nothing to be wrought in their Lord's supper.

⁸² [The words in italic are Jewel's.]

but meat and drink set upon the table to be received by such as come unto it, that which is wrought in the Lord's supper must be wrought ^f in the meat and drink which our Lord hath at his table. And as the matter whereof our Lord's supper is made is bread and wine, so the supper made thereof is our Lord's body and blood, into which the bread and wine, by the almighty power of the word, is changed. So that if ye will shew Christ himself to be ^g made or ^h wrought in our Lord's supper, ye must shew bread and wine to be changed into Christ himself, and so to be eaten of his faithful at his table. But whereas there are three things, Christ that maketh the supper, the communicants that receive the supper, and the supper itself; ye say, that Christ for his part giveth his own self verily present, likewise that the communicants for their part eat him by faith and spirit. And so ye shew that the maker of the supper worketh, and that the communicants work. But all this while ye shew us not what is wrought in the matter of the supper, that is to say, in the bread and wine, nor what is made of them. O great slander that ye were charged withal, which not so much as by your own word ye are discharged of!

How much sounder is the ⁱ catholic doctrine, which teacheth the proper work of our Lord's supper to be the turning of the substance of bread and wine into his body and blood? Which work because ye will not confess, ye have devised a work of your own working, which is not proper to our Lord's supper. For if I can receive Christ in my house at home by faith and spirit, how is that work ^k proper to his supper, which may be wrought without his supper? or can I not believe in Christ, or lift up my spirit unto him, ^l except I come to supper? or if I do call for Christ, doth he not give himself by grace unto me?

"But," say ye, "at the Lord's supper Christ giveth himself verily present." To what purpose, I pray you? "That we may eat him," say ye, "by faith and spirit." Well reasoned forsooth. Have ye forgotten the giving to eat, and eating that which is given, to be relatives, one of them having relation to the other? If Christ do exhibit himself verily present, as your Latin text hath, or giveth his own self verily and presently, as your interpreter [*orig.* gentlewoman] telleth your tale for you; doth not he so exhibit or give himself as he will be received? or doth he shew in one hand a piece of bread, and with the other strike us on the head with a stone? If he give himself verily present, as ye say, we take him verily present. And then (unless ye mean by himself his grace, which is of Christ, and not Christ himself) we eat him verily present, not only by faith and spirit, but by taking him into ^m our mouth and body. If it please him at any time to be eaten by faith and spirit alone, (after which sort he is daily eaten by those that humbly call upon him,) then he giveth not himself verily present, but by faith and spirit, otherwise named grace, or some spiritual effect of his working. But in

1 Cor. xi.
What is
supper pro-
perly.

^f The bread
is for us, not
we for the
bread.

^g Christ
made: Christ
wrought: a
strange divi-
nity.

^h Untruth.
For M. Harding
well
knoweth,
that this fond
folly was
never catho-
lic.

The proper
work of our
Lord's sup-
per.

ⁱ Untruth.
For Abraham
and Isaac re-
ceived
Christ's very
body, before
the sacram-
ent was or-
dained. It is
not peculiar
to the sup-
per.

^k Such un-
christian
scorns a-
gainst
Christ's ordi-
nances are
very unseem-
ly.

^l Christ of-
fereth him-
self unto our
faith: and by
our faith he
is received.

How make
the defend-
ers Christ
verily present
in his supper.

^m This is the
cannibal's di-
vinity. St.
Ambrose
saith: *Non
hic panis, qui
vadit in ven-
trem.*

our Lord's supper the scripture requireth a special and peculiar presence of Christ, to wit, of his flesh, so as it may be eaten. If then he give himself verily present, as ye say, he is present in his own person, God and man, with body, with blood, with soul, with Godhead. If ye mean the very presence of his Godhead, that presence belongeth no more to Christ than to the Father and to the Holy Ghost. And so have ye not declared any peculiar presence belonging to his supper. For by presence of his Godhead he is always verily present, as well before supper as at, or after supper; because he filleth heaven and earth. It remaineth that either ye understand not yourselves, or wilfully deceive that infinite number of souls for whose sake Christ hath shed his blood.

n Untruth.
For the finest
and best
learned fa-
thers have
maintained
the same, as
shall appear.

u Your error in making the presence of Christ in baptism like to his presence in the supper is too gross. For although Christ work both our regeneration and our nourishment by his divine sacraments, yet in baptism our regeneration is by name attributed in the gospel to the Holy Ghost also, to shew that Christ's presence there is spiritual. But his supper consisteth of his body and blood, which are so united to Christ, as they are peculiar to the second Person in Godhead. Again, forasmuch as they are received into us as food to nourish our bodies to resurrection, as the gospel saith, and no man's body is otherwise nourished than by eating indeed that meat whereof he is nourished, and the flesh of Christ, as himself saith, is meat indeed, and his blood drink indeed; we are forced to believe another manner of presence in the sacrament of the altar than in baptism. And therefore ye have handled this matter too slightly and coldly.

The presence
of Christ in
baptism and
in the supper
is distinct,
which the
defenders
make to be
like.

o Untruth.
For there is
no such word
in all the
gospel.

Whereas ye say, we do not touch the body of Christ with teeth and mouth, p are ye so accustomed to swallow down whole morsels, as ye never touch them with your teeth? or have ye learned to eat that which ye touch not with your mouth? If Christ said, "Take, eat; this is my body," and the apostles took and eat the same, neither could they take and eat without touching: it seemeth ye handle eating too slightly and coldly, when ye will have it without touching. Chrysostom, a more substantial hand-

p Heathenish
and unchrist-
ian scoffing.

That we
touch
Christ's
body, and eat
it with our
mouth, and
how.

q As you see
Christ's body
in the sacra-
ment, even
so ye touch
it, and so ye
eat it, and
none other-
wise. St. Am-
brose saith:
*Fide Christus
tangitur:
non tangitur
corpore.*

ler of things than any of you is, saith of Christ's body, *Quod omnium maximum est, atque præcipuum, in terra non conspicaris tantum, sed tangis: neque solum tangis, sed comedis, et eo accepto, domum redis*: "Of all things that be in earth, what is the greatest and the chiefest, q that doest thou not only see but touchest: neither only doest thou touch it, but also eat it; and having received it, thou goest home again." How we touch it we know, for it is not now a mortal and corruptible body, wherein we may fasten our teeth, but glorious and immortal, r and therefore we touch it by the reason of the accidents of bread and wine, with whose forms (as St. Augustine speaketh) it is covered or veiled, and so cometh it to our teeth and to our mouth, and nourisheth both our bodies and souls to life everlasting. "Nay

In 1 Cor.
hom. 24.
[x. 219.]

r Untruth,
childish and
unsavoury.
The learned
fathers never
knew those
follies.

In lib. Sen-
tent. Prosp.

The defenders' imaginary holding of Christ, holdeth not Christ as he is in the sacrament, Matt. xxvi.

but we (say ye) hold him fast, and eat him by faith, by understanding, and by the Spirit." I pray you, be not too hasty to hold him before ye have him. How came ye by him? His grace he giveth divers ways, but himself bodily and presently as man he never promised to give otherwise than when he said, "Take, eat; this is my body." And then Judas, ^s (who had but a very mean faith,) because he received the sacrament, received him also. And our blessed Lady, although she had a most perfect faith, received him not after that sort, because then she received not the sacrament. How can ye assure yourselves that your faith taketh the body of Christ, ^t which was never promised to your faith? If your faith take him not as he is in the sacrament, how can your faith hold him fast there? As herebefore ye have said much and proved little against the real presence, wrestling and stretching certain fathers' sentences and the scripture itself to that purpose, not wholly and faithfully, but by piecemeal and patchedly alleged, so as ye might best make them serve to the maintenance of your false doctrine: right so in the conclusion of that part of your Apology, with a like grace ye heap a number of mangled authorities together, whereby to persuade, that forasmuch as the fathers have advertised us to lift up our minds to heavenward, we should not think we eat the flesh of Christ as being here present with us under the form of bread. Therefore whereas ye lay to the catholics' charge, as though by their sacrilege the people were bereft of a great benefit, in that they be taught to be content with the one kind, under the same receiving no less than if they had both; how much more worthily are ye to be charged with the crime of sacrilege, that ^u rob them of the greatest treasure that is in the church, so much as in you lieth, the body and blood of our Lord: and instead thereof pretend to deliver unto them a piece of baker's bread and a cup of wine? But let us see what good reason or authority ye bring out of the fathers against the true presence of Christ in the blessed sacrament.

^s Judas had a very mean faith.

^t Untruth, as shall appear. But where was Christ's body promised to your mouths?

^u Untruth. For we rob them not, but offer them indeed and verily the body of Christ: and shew them, where and where-with they may receive it.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

O, M. Harding, your conscience knoweth, and will testify against yourself, that we never called the holy sacrament of Christ's body *baker's bread*, no more than we call the sacrament of baptism *a pail of water*. We have always spoken honourably and reverently thereof, as it was meet we should speak of the mysteries of the death of Christ, and as the holy catholic fathers have evermore used to speak before us.

These wild, and wanton, and unseemly speeches agree rather with your doctrine. For call your own words a

little to remembrance. In your first Answer ye call the holy sacrament, as it is used and ministered by us, according to the order of the holy fathers, “a piece of bread not worth a point:” in this place ye call the holy ministration, so used by us, “a lean and a carrion banquet:” in the next division ye call it “a toy.” These be your words, M. Harding, and may well stand both with the sobriety of your spirit, and also with the whole substance and tenor of your religion.

We call it *the sacrament of thanksgiving*, and *the sacrament of Christ's body and blood*. And with the holy father St. Augustine we say: *In sacramentis videndum est, non quid sint, sed quid significant* [leg. *ostendant*]: “In sacraments we must consider, *not what they be*” (in themselves), “but what they signify.”

Augustin.
contra Maxi-
min. lib. 3.
cap. 22. [viii.
725.]

We have no special regard to the bread, wine, or water; for they are creatures corruptible, as well after consecration as they were before; but we direct our faith only unto the very body and blood of Christ: not as being there really and fleshly present, as ye have imagined, but as sitting in heaven at the right hand of God the Father. The holy father Chrysostom saith, although in general words, not speaking specially of this sacrament: *Oculi fidei, quando vident hæc ineffabilia bona, ne sentiunt quidem hæc visibilia. Tantum inter hæc et illa interest*: “The eyes of our faith, when they behold these unspeakable good things, they do not so much as mark these outward things that we see with our bodily eyes. *So great is the difference between these things.*” And herein resteth the grossness of your error, that ye divide not the one thing from the other.

Chrysost. in
Genes. hom.
24. [iv. 228.]

Augustin. in
Joh. tract. 26.
[iii. pt. 2.
498.]

St. Augustine saith: *Aliud est sacramentum, aliud res* [al. *virtus*] *sacramenti*: “The sacrament of Christ's body is one thing; and the *substance of the sacrament*” (or Christ's body represented by the sacrament) “is another thing.”

Augustin. de
Doctrina
Christiana,
lib. 3. cap. 5.
[iii. 47.]

And again he saith: *Ea demum est miserabilis animi servitus, signa pro rebus accipere*: “To take the *signs*” (or sacraments) “instead of the *things themselves*,” (that be signified, as M. Harding doth,) “is the miserable bondage of the soul.” In like manner Origen saith: *Simpliciores*

nescientes distinguere, ac discernere, quæ sint, quæ in scripturis divinis interiori homini, quæ vero exteriori deputanda sint, vocabulorum similitudinibus falsi, ad ineptas quasdam fabulas, et figmenta inania se contulerunt: “Simple men, not able to discern in the holy scriptures what things ought to be applied to the *outer* [ed. 1570 *utter*] *man*, and what to the *inner*, being deceived by the likeness of words, have turned themselves to a sort of *peevish fables and vain phantasies*.”

You call our doctrine “naked and cold,” for that we say, “the sacrament is a figure.” And yet, because ye cannot in any wise deny but the same word *figure*, to the same purpose, is commonly used of all the ancient catholic fathers and doctors of the church; therefore ye thought it good to qualify and to mince the matter, and to say, “It is a figure, not of the body, but of the death of Christ.” And here it is a world to see, how pitifully ye trouble yourself with your variety, and change, and shift of figures.

First you say, “The sacrament, by the judgment of Damascene, is called a figure before the consecration,” that is to say, before the sacrament be a sacrament: for before consecration it is no sacrament. Afterward upon better advice [ed. 1570 *cause*] ye say, “The forms only, and the shows and accidents, are the figure of Christ’s body.” Again you say, “Christ’s body invisible is a figure of Christ’s body visible,” that is to say, a thing uncertain is a figure of a thing most certain. Now last of all ye say, as I think no man ever said before, “The very body of Christ itself is a figure of the death of Christ.” Thus many pretty strange unknown *figures* ye are driven to devise, thereby to avoid one simple, plain, usual, and common *figure*. For, to leave an infinite number of other ancient fathers, St. Augustine saith: *Dominus figuram corporis sui discipulis suis commendavit, et tradidit*: “Our Lord commended and delivered to his disciples a *figure*” (not, as ye say, of his death, but) “of his body.”

Whereas you say, “The body of Christ is present indeed, and that his death is absent only:” if ye list to cavil, as ye do, and, as your manner is, idly to play with the words and phrases of the ancient fathers, ye might as well, and by as good warrant say, that “Christ’s *death* is as

Origen. in
Prologo in
Cantica Can-
ticor. [iii. 28.]

M. Harding,
art. 12. div.
2. [Supr. vol.
iii. 132.]

Augustin. in
Psal. 3. [iv.
7.]

present as his *body*." For St. Cyprian saith: *Passio Christi est sacrificium, quod offerimus*: "The sacrifice that we offer is the *passion of Christ*." Chrysostom saith: *In mysteriis mors Christi perficitur*: "The death of Christ is wrought in the mysteries." St. Hierom saith: *Christus nobis quotidie crucifigitur*: "Unto us Christ is crucified every day ⁸¹." And St. Gregory saith: *Christus iterum in hoc mysterio moritur*: "In this mystery" (of the holy communion) "Christ is put to death again." By these words, thus pressed and racked, as your manner is, ye may easily prove, not only that Christ's body, but also that his passion, and death, and bloodshedding, is verily present.

Ye say, "ye adore the sacraments with godly honour." We answer you, as Christ sometime answered the woman of Samaria, *Vos adoratis, quod nescitis*: "Ye adore and worship, ye know not what." For who ever willed you thus to *adore* the sacrament? who taught you, who bade you so to do? what prophet, what apostle, what father, what doctor of the church?

But here, M. Harding, ye do us great wrong, to say we "call Christ's body an idol," saving that ye have a charter to speak what ye list. For we know, and have evermore confessed with Chrysostom, that "the body of Christ is worthy of the highest honour:" and we *adore* it, and worship it, even as the *very body* of the Son of God. Howbeit, as it is said before, Christ's body is one thing, and the sacrament is another. The sacrament is in earth: Christ's body is in heaven, at the right hand of God the Father. And therefore Chrysostom saith in the same place: *Ascende ergo ad cæli portas, et diligenter attende: imo non cæli, sed cæli calororum: et tunc, quod dicimus intueris*: "Mount up therefore unto the *gates of heaven*, and diligently consider: nay, I say not unto the *gates of heaven*, but unto the *gates of the heaven of heavens*: and so shall ye see the things that we speak of."

But what meant you, M. Harding, thus out of season

⁸¹ [Hieron. in Psal. xcvii. (*leg. Ps. xcv.*) This passage, with the same false print in the margin, occurs supra vol. iii. p. 361. See note ⁶² in that page.]

Cyprian. lib. 2. epist. 3. [p. 109.]

Chrysost. in Act. hom. 2. [leg. hom. 21. tom. ix. 176.]

Hieronym. in Psal. xcvii. [l. Psal. xcv. tom. ii. 377.]
De Con. dist. 2. Quid sit.

John iv. 22.

Chrysost. 1 Cor. hom. 24. [x. 216. 218.]

Chrysost. in eodem hom. [x. 218.]

to press in with your *lenten argument*, and to say, "It is superstitious with you to eat dry and *lenten meats*?" If ye say, there can be no superstition in choice of meats, either ye are deceived yourself, or else ye seek occasion by the way to deceive others.

Tertullian saith: *Deus ventre non colitur, nec cibis, quos Dominus dicit perire, et in secessu, naturali lege, purgari.* Tertull. [leg. Novatian.] in epist. de cibis Judæis. [p. 754.] Nam, qui per escas Dominum colit, prope est, ut Dominum habeat ventrem suum: "God is not honoured with the belly, nor with meats, which the Lord Christ saith do perish, and are purged in conveyance by natural order. For whoso by meats honoureth the Lord, in a manner maketh his belly to be his lord." St. Hilary saith: *Hæretici sicco panis cibo vivunt. Sed quis tandem otiosi hujus propositi profectus est? Totum hoc inane atque ridiculum est, et cum ipsis superstitionis causis miserabile:* "Heretics live by dry bread: but what profit is there in this idle purpose? It is altogether vain and foolish, and, in respect of the causes of their superstition, it is also miserable." Hilar. in Psal. lxiiv. [p. 163.]

St. Hierom saith: *Quid prodest oleo non vesci, et molestias quasdam difficultatesque ciborum quærere, caricas, piper, nuces, palmarum fructus, similam, mel, pistacia?Audio præterea, quosdam contra regulam [al. rerum], hominumque naturam, aquam non bibere, nec vesci pane: sed sorbitiunculas delicatas, et contrita olera, betarumque succum, non calice sorbere, sed concha: pro pudor. Non erubescimus istiusmodi ineptiis? nec tædet superstitionis? Insuper etiam famam abstinentiæ in deliciis quærimus:* "What availeth it to eat no oil, and with pain and much ado curiously to seek for meats, figs, pepper, nuts, dates, fine white bread, honey, and pistacia? Beside this, I hear say there be some which, contrary to the common order and nature of men, will neither drink water nor eat bread, but seek for delicate supplings, and herbs shred together, and the juice of beets, and receive the same, not out of a cup, but out of a shell. *Fie for shame: do we not blush at such foolishness? are we not weary of such superstition?* And yet beside all this, living in such curious delicacy, we look to be praised for our fasting." To leave all others,

Eras. in An-
not. in 14 ad
Rom.

Erasmus, a man of great judgment, saith: *Major est in his rebus superstitio apud Christianos,..... quam unquam fuit inter Judæos*: "There is more superstition herein among Christians, than ever was among the Jews⁸²." We weigh not the choice of fish or flesh, but the burden of the mind and the snare of the conscience.

Chrysost. 1
Cor. hom. 24.
[x. 216.]

But to pass over your needless lenten talk, the feast that we set before the people is neither *dry* nor *carrion*, (notwithstanding it liketh you, by your uncivil terms, so to call it,) but spiritual, holy, and heavenly; I mean, *the very body of Jesus Christ the Son of God*, to the comfort and relieving of body and soul. And yet, forasmuch as it so well delighteth your ears to call it *carrion*, we refuse not the name. Chrysostom likewise, although in more reverend and civil sense, calleth it *carrion*. These be his words: *Ubi est cadaver, ibi sunt aquilæ. Cadaver Domini corpus est propter mortem. Aquilas autem appellat, ut ostendat, ad alta eum oportere contendere, qui ad hoc corpus accedit, et nihil cum terra debere illum habere commune, nec ad inferiora trahi, et repere, sed ad superiora semper volare, et in solem justitiæ intueri, mentisque oculum habere acutissimum. Aquilarum enim, non graculorum, est hæc mensa*: "Where as the *carrion* is, there are the eagles. The *carrion* is the *body of Christ*, in respect of his death. But he nameth eagles, to shew, that whoso will approach to this body must mount aloft, and have no dealing with the earth, *nor be drawn and creep downward; but must evermore flee up*, and behold the sun of justice, and have the eye of his mind quick and sharp. For this is a table of *eagles*" (that flee on high), "not of *jays*" (that creep beneath)⁸³.

Ye add further: "But, say ye, at the Lord's supper Christ giveth himself verily present. To what purpose? I pray you. That we may eat him (say ye) by faith and spirit. Well reasoned, forsooth." Now forsooth, M. Hard-

⁸² [Erasmus in 14 Rom. "Hodie videmus inter Christianos ciborum delectu, quam," &c.]
⁸³ [Supra vol. ii. 326, note 24.]

"prope plus esse superstitionis in

ing, this is *hick scorne's*⁸⁴ logic, far unmeet for a man of your gravity.

"Have ye forgotten" (say you) "the giving to eat, and eating that which is given, to be relatives, one of them having relation to the other? If Christ do exhibit himself verily present, doth not he so exhibit or give himself, as he will be received? If he give himself verily present, we take him verily present, and then we eat him verily present, not only by faith and spirit, but by taking him into our mouth and belly." Verily, M. Harding, this, of your part, was not very well reasoned. For a man may have Christ *verily present*, although he have him not in his mouth. St. Augustine saith: *Habes Christum in presenti*, Augustin. in Joh. tract. 50. [iii. pt. 2. 633.] *per signum: in presenti, per fidem: in presenti, per baptismatis sacramentum*: "Thou hast Christ in the time *present*, by his sign or token: in the time *present*, by faith: in the time *present*, by the sacrament of baptism." Thus many ways we have Christ *present*, and *verily present*. And St. Augustine imagineth Christ thus to say unto the people of Capernaum: *Non hoc corpus, quod videtis, manducaturi estis*: "Ye shall not eat" (with your bodily mouth) "this *body* of mine that you see." We remember well the relation that is between *giving* and *receiving*: and therefore we marvel so much the more, that you so unskillfully would abuse it. For as Christ offereth his body spiritually to our faith and spirit, even so spiritually, by our faith and spirit, we receive it. And where ye say, "We take Christ's body into our mouths and bodies," as having forgotten that Christ saith, "The words that I have spoken be spirit and life;" St. Augustine would soon have removed you from this gross error. For thus he saith unto you: *Quid paras dentem et ventrem? Crede et manducasti*: "What, preparest thou thy tooth and thy belly?" (This eating is spiritual.) "Believe" (in Christ) "and thou hast eaten."

⁸⁴ ["Hycke-scorner:" the title of an old Morality, printed by Wynkin de Worde. The meaning is, "a travelled scoffer at religion." It seems uncertain, whe-

ther the name was taken from the drama, or the name of the play from a term already current. See Nares' Glossary.]

Ambros. in
Luc. lib. 6.
cap. 8. [1.
1397.]

St. Ambrose saith : *Fide tangitur Christus : fide videtur. Non tangitur corpore : non oculis comprehenditur* : “ *By faith Christ is touched : by faith he is seen. He is not touched with body : he is not seen with eye.*”

Gregor. Nys-
sen. de Crea-
tione homi-
nis, cap. 19.
[1. 95.]

Likewise saith Gregorius Nyssenus, St. Basil's brother : *Ego aliam escam agnosco : quæ similitudinem quandam proportionis escæ hujus corporis gerat : cujus voluptas, atque suavitas ad animum solummodo transeat* : “ I know another kind of meat, bearing the likeness and resemblance of our bodily meat :” (for that this inwardly feedeth the mind, as the other outwardly feedeth the body :) “ the pleasure and sweetness whereof” (goeth not into the mouth or belly, but) “ *passeth only into the soul.*” Thus *we understand ourselves*, M. Harding, *and deceive not*, as you say, *the souls that Christ hath bought.*” God forgive you and others, that so have done, that the blood of many be not required at your hands.

Chrysost. ad
Ep. ad Eph.
hom. 20. [xi.
147.]
Bernard. su-
per Missus
est, hom. 3.
[iii. 755.]
Leo in Ser-
mon. de 4
Feria, cap. 1.

“ Your error” (ye say) “ in making the presence of Christ in baptism like to his presence in the supper, is too gross.” Here is one error more than any of the learned catholic fathers ever noted. St. Chrysostom saith : “ In the sacrament of baptism we are made flesh of Christ's flesh, and bone of his bones.” St. Bernard saith : *Lavemur in sanguine ejus* : “ *Let us be washed in his blood.*” Leo saith : *Christi sanguine rigaris quando in mortem ipsius baptizaris* : “ Thou art washed in the blood of Christ, when thou art baptized in his death ⁸⁴.”

By these few it may appear, that Christ is *present at the sacrament of baptism*, even as he is present at the *holy supper* : unless ye will say, we may be made *flesh of Christ's flesh, and be washed in his blood*, and be partakers of him, and have him *present*, without his *presence*. Therefore Chrysostom, when he hath spoken vehemently of the sacrament of the *supper*, he concludeth thus : *Sic et in baptismo* : “ *Even so is it also in the sacrament of baptism.*” The body of Christ is likewise *present* in them both. And

⁸⁴ [The Editor has not discovered any sermon of Leo “ de 4 Feria,” which contains these words.]

for that cause Beda saith: *Nulli est aliquatenus ambigen-* Beda in
dum, tunc unumquunque fidelium corporis sanguinisque 1 Cor. x.
Dominici participem fieri, quando in baptismo membrum
Christi efficitur: "No man may doubt but every faithful
 man is then made *partaker of the body and blood of Christ,*
when in baptism he is made the member of Christ⁸⁵." As
 for your real and fleshly presence, it hath been often talked
 of on your part, but never proved.

We say, *We touch not Christ's body with our mouth or*
teeth. "What," say you, "be ye used to swallow down
 whole morsels?" Such childish and wanton talk, M. Hard-
 ing, specially in the debating of matters of religion, would
 better become some lighter person. We know, that, as
 St. Augustine saith: *Gratia Christi non consumitur morsi-* Augustin. in
bus: "The grace of Christ is *not consumed by morsels.*" Johan. tract.
 Ye might have made the like answer to St. Augustine: for 27. [iii. pt. 2.
 he saith to you, as I have alleged him before: "What! 502.]
 preparest thou thy *tooth* and thy *belly*?" O, M. Harding, 25. [ibid.
 the eating of the body of Christ is a work spiritual, and 489.]
 needeth neither bruising of tooth, nor swallowing of throat,
 nor help of the outward and bodily mouth. If ye know
 thus much, why do you dissemble it? If ye know it not,
 ye come too rathe to speak of these things.

St. Basil saith: *Est spirituale os interioris hominis, quo* Basil. in Ps.
nutritur, recipiens verbum vitæ, quod verbum est panis qui xxxiii. [1.
descendit de cælo: "There is a spiritual mouth of the inner 144.]
 man, by which he is nourished by receiving" (Christ) "the *Ἔστι καὶ*
 word of life, which is the bread that came from heaven." *νοητὸν σφό-*
μα τοῦ ἐνδο-
αὐθράπου.

Again he saith: *Gustate, et videte, quod suavis est Do-* Basil. in
minus. Sæpe observavimus, vires animi habere nomina ab eund. Psal.
aliqua similitudine membrorum corporis. Quoniam ergo Do- [1. 148.]
minus noster est verus panis, et ejus caro est verus cibus, *Ἐπειδὴ ἄρ-*
necesse est, eam voluptatem quæ ex illius panis delectatione *τος ἀληθι-*
affertur, in nobis per gustum existere spiritualem: "Taste *νός ὁ κύριος*
 ye, and see that our Lord is gracious. We have often- *ἡμῶν, καὶ ἡ*
 times marked, that the powers of the mind have their *σὰρξ αὐτοῦ*
 names from some likeness of the parts of the body. There- *τῆς εὐφρο-*
σύνης τοῦ
ἄρτου διὰ
γεύσεως ἡ-
μῶν νοητῆς
ἐγγίνεσθαι.

⁸⁵ [These words are cited by Bede as from St. Augustine's *Sermo ad Infantes.*]

fore seeing our Lord is bread indeed, and his flesh is verily meat, it cannot be chosen but the pleasure and sweetness of that bread must be wrought in us" (not by our bodily mouth, but) "*by the spiritual taste of the soul.*"

Cyprian. [Arnold.] de Cœna Domini. [app. cxlii.]

St. Cyprian saith: *Esus carnis ejus quædam est aviditas, et quoddam desiderium manendi in eo*: "The eating of that flesh is a certain *greediness*, and a certain *desire* to dwell in him."

Augustin, in Psal. xlviii. [iv. 441.]

St. Augustine saith: *Ipse est panis cordis nostri*: "Christ is the bread" (not of our belly, but) "*of*

[In Psal. ciii. serm. 3. iv. 1160.]

our heart." And again: *Intus esuri, intus siti*: "*Hunger thou within, thirst thou within.*" Likewise again he saith:

Augustin, in Johan. tract. 26. [iii. pt. 2. 498.]

Videte, fratres, panem cœlestem: spirituali ore [leg. *spiritualiter*] *manducate*: "O, my brethren, behold this heavenly bread: eat it with the *spiritual or inner mouth of the mind.*"

Thus are we taught to eat that *spiritual meat* without chewing, or swallowing, or use or office of the bodily mouth. Therefore St. Augustine saith: *Non manducans, manducat: et manducans, non manducat*: "He that eateth not, eateth: and he that eateth, eateth not."

4 Sent. dist. 10. Secundum hos.

Chrysostom. in 1 Cor. hom. 24. [x. 219.]

But Chrysostom saith: *Quod omnium maximum est, atque præcipuum, in terra non conspicaris tantum, sed etiam tangis: nec tangis tantum, sed etiam comedis*: "The greatest and worthiest thing that is, thou doest not only behold in the earth, but also touchest it: neither doest thou only touch it, but also eatest it." Here I beseech you, M. Harding, dissemble no longer, but speak plainly. How do you *behold* the body of Christ in the sacrament? with what senses, with what eyes do you see it? If ye say, with your bodily eyes, why say you, *Christ's body is there invisible, covered with accidents, and cannot be seen*? If ye say (as it is indeed) that ye see the same body only with the spiritual eyes of your mind, then ye allege Chrysostom directly and plainly against yourself.

Augustin. epist. 84. [al. 85. ii. 349.] Bernar. Meditation. cap. 3. [leg. cap. 5. p. 281.]

But St. Augustine saith: *Habet fides oculos suos*: "*Faith hath her eyes to see withal.*" And St. Bernard saith: *Visio animæ, intellectus est*: "*The seeing of the soul is understanding.*" With these eyes we see Christ, that is to say, we understand Christ, or believe in Christ. St. Augustine

saith: *Velamen positum erat contra faciem eorum, ne viderent Christum in scripturis*: "There was a veil laid over their face, that they should not see Christ in the scriptures."⁸⁶

Augustin. in Evangelium secund. Lucam, [leg. sec. Joann.] serm. 49. [v. 666.]

Chrysostom saith: *Non tantum præstare possunt corporales oculi, qui visibilia cernunt, quantum oculi Spiritus, qui ea quæ non videntur, neque subsistunt, videre possunt*:

Chrysostom. in Genes. hom. 10. [iv. 76.]

"These bodily eyes, that see things visible, cannot do so much as the eyes of the Spirit. For these eyes are able to see the things that be not seen, and have no being." Likewise again he saith: *Oculi animi, etiamsi parietes, etiamsi montes, etiamsi montium moles, etiamsi cælorum corpora compererint obstantia, omnia facile prætercurrunt*: "The eyes of the mind, notwithstanding they find walls, or mountains, or the bodies of the heavens to stand against them, yet will they easily pass through them all."

Chrysostom. de Verb. Esa. Vidi Domin. hom. 2. [vi. 107.]

"With these eyes," saith Chrysostom, "we see that most worthy and most glorious body of Christ." Therefore he saith: *Cre- damus, et videmus præsentem Jesum*: "Let us believe, and we see Jesus present before us"⁸⁶. Likewise St. Hierom saith: *Est intelligentia spiritualis, qua Christus cernitur*: "There is a spiritual understanding wherewith Christ is seen"⁸⁷. Otherwise St. Ambrose saith: *Christum nunc secundum veritatem videre non possumus*: "As now, according to the truth," (with bodily sight) "we cannot see Christ"⁸⁸.

Chrysostom. in Marcum, hom. 6. [ed. Paris. 1588. tom. ii. 1061.]

Hieronym. in Amos, lib. 3. cap. 9. [ad. c. 8. [iii. 1443.]

Ambros. in Oratione, de Fide Resurrectionis. [ii. 1164.]

Now, as the body of Christ is seen, so is it touched: and as it is touched, so is it eaten. But it is not seen with bodily eyes: it is not touched with bodily fingers: for St. Ambrose saith: *Fide tangitur Christus: fide Christus videtur*: "By faith Christ is touched: by faith Christ is seen." Therefore the body of Christ is not eaten with the bodily mouth, but only by faith, which is the spiritual mouth of the soul.

Ambros. in Lucam, lib. 6. cap. 8. [i. 1397.]

⁸⁶ [Chrysost. in Marc. This is extant only in Latin, and is spurious. Supra ii. 396.]

⁸⁷ [Hieron. "Quibus ingerimus famem esse prædictam intelligentiæ spiritualis, in qua

"Christus cernitur, passio Domini," &c.]

⁸⁸ [St. Ambros. de Fid. Resurrect. This is the second book "de excessu Fratris sui Satyri."]

“Judas,” ye say, “who had but a mean faith, because he received the sacrament, received him also.” O how much is poor Judas beholden to these men! Christ calleth him the *child of perdition*. St. John saith: “The devil was entered into him.” Again Christ saith: “He was a devil.” Therefore this *mean faith* that you allow him must needs be a very little pretty faith; even such a faith as ye might well allow the devil.

“Yet with the same mean faith,” ye say, “receiving the sacrament, he received Christ also.” First, it is not well and thoroughly agreed upon, that Judas received the sacrament, or was present at all at the last supper. St. Hilary saith plainly: “He was gone forth about his wicked purpose, and received it not.” But be it, that St. Hilary were deceived, and that Judas indeed received the sacrament; yet, as it is said before, Christ’s *body* is one thing, and the *sacrament of Christ’s body* is another thing.

St. Augustine saith: *Discipuli manducabant panem Dominum: Judas panem Domini, contra Dominum*: “The disciples did eat the *bread which is the Lord*: but Judas did eat” (not the Lord, but) “the” (sacrament, which is the) “*bread of the Lord* against the Lord.” And yet in plainer sort he saith: *Christus adhibuit Judam ad convivium, in quo corporis et sanguinis sui figuram discipulis suis commendavit, et tradidit*: “Christ admitted Judas unto his table, whereat he gave and delivered unto his disciples *a figure of his body*.”

Again, St. Augustine saith, as in the person of Christ: *Qui in me non manet, et in quo ego non maneo, ne se dicat aut existimet manducare corpus meum, aut sanguinem meum bibere*: “He that abideth not in me, and I in him, let him not say or think, that he either eateth my body or drinketh my blood.”

The objection that ye make of the *resurrection of our bodies* is light and vain, and to small purpose. For if no man shall have part in the resurrection, but only they that have received the sacrament of Christ’s body, then are all the holy *fathers, patriarchs, and prophets* of the Old Testament, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron, and such

John xiii. 2.

John vi. 70.

Hilar. in
Matt. canon.
30. [p. 740.]Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
59. [iii. pt. 2.
663.]Augustin. in
Psal. iii. [iv.
7.]Augustin. de
Civitat. lib.
21. cap. 25.
[viii. 647.]

others; then are infinite numbers of Christian children; then are many godly martyrs, which being baptized in the blood of Christ, were taken out of this life before they could receive the sacrament, utterly excluded for ever from all hope of *resurrection*, which were a thing too horrible to enter into Christian ears. But Christ, when he spake these words, meant not the receiving of the sacrament, but the spiritual eating of his *very body*, and the spiritual drinking of his *very blood*: whereof he is made partaker unto *resurrection* and *life everlasting*, whosoever believeth in the death of Christ. And therefore St. Basil saith of the sacrament of baptism: *Baptisma est vis et efficacia ad resurrectionem*: "Baptism is a power and a strength unto resurrection." But hereof we shall have occasion offered to say more hereafter.

Further, "How can ye assure yourselves," say you, "that your faith receiveth the body of Christ, which was never promised to your faith?" By the way, I beseech you, M. Harding, when or where was Christ's body ever promised to your *mouth*? Verily Christ promised his body to be received *by faith*, and *by faith only*, and *none otherwise*. For thus he saith: *Ego sum panis ille vitæ: qui venit ad me, non esuriet: et qui credit in me, non sitiet unquam*: "I am that bread of life: he that cometh unto me shall never hunger: and he that believeth in me shall never thirst." Here have you, M. Harding, a *plain promise made unto your* [ed. 1570, *our*] *faith*. But of your *mouth* we hear nothing. If you have ought to shew out of the scriptures, doctors, or councils, let it appear, and that in plain words, without colour. Otherwise, if ye cavil in words, we must say ye have nothing. Therefore the ancient father Origen saith: *Idcirco dicitur panis vitæ, ut habeat gustus animæ, quod degustet*: "Therefore is Christ called the bread of life, that" (our faith, which is) "the taste of our soul, may have what to taste."

Clemens Alexandrinus saith: *Comedite carnes meas, et bibite sanguinem meum: evidenter fidei et promissionis, quod est esculentum et poculentum, dicens allegorice*: "Eat my flesh, and drink my blood: meaning hereby, under an

Basil. de
Sanct. Baptl-
smate. [ii.
114.]
τὸ δὲ βά-
πτισμα δύ-
ναμις ἐστὶ
πρὸς τὴν
ἀνάστασιν.

Origen. in
Cantica.
hom. 2. [leg.
lib. 2. iii. 66.]

Clemens in
Pædagogō,
lib. 1. cap. 6.
[1. 121.]

allegory, or by way of a figure, the meat and drink that is of" (our) "*faith*, and" (his) *promise* ⁸⁹."

Tertull. [de Resurrec. carn. c. 37. p. 347.]

Tertullian saith: *Eundem sermonem Christus etiam carnem suam dixit: quia sermo caro factus est: proinde in causa vitæ recipiendus [appetendus]: devorandus auditu: ruminandus intellectu: et fide digerendus est: "The same word Christ called his flesh: for the Word was made flesh. Therefore he must be received in cause of life: he must be devoured by hearing: he must be chewed by understanding: he must be digested by faith."*

Cyprian. [Arnold.] de Cæna Domini. [app. cxlv.] Augustine, in Johan. tract. 26. [ill. pt. 2. 494.] Augustin. de Verb. Apost. serm. 2. [v. 641.]

St. Cyprian saith: *Quod est esca carni, hoc est animæ fides: "As meat is to the flesh, so is faith unto the soul."*

St. Augustine saith: *Credere in eum, hoc est, manducare:— illud bibere, quid est, nisi vivere? "To believe in him is to eat him.—That drinking of him, what is it else but to live by him?"*

I trust, M. Harding, it may appear hereby, there is some promise made hereof *unto our faith*. Now shew you as evident promise made *to your mouth and belly*, and then your reader haply will believe you.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 14. Divis. 2.

[Vol. iv. p. 24.]

And therefore in celebrating these mysteries, the people are to good purpose exhorted, before they come to receive the holy communion, *to lift up their hearts*, and to direct their minds to heaven-ward; because he is there, by whom we must be fed, and live.

M. HARDING.

I pray you, which these mysteries mean you? Those that ye have in your new communion, or those that we have at the altar of God in the catholic church of Christ? If ye mean your own new devised toy, thereof ye cannot bring any sufficient reason against the church party, which condemneth the same. If ye

⁸⁹ [Clemens Alex. Φάγεσθέ μου ἄνθρωπος, ἐκ πολλῶν συνεστηκυῖα τὰς σάρκας, εἰπὼν, καὶ πίεσθέ μου τὸ αἷμα· ἐναργὲς τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τὸ πότιμον ἀληγορῶν, δι' ὃν ἡ Ἐκκλησία, καθάπερ μελῶν, ἄρδεταί τε καὶ αὔξεται, συγκροτεῖται τε καὶ συμπήγνυται ἐξ ἀμφοῖν· σώματος μὲν, τῆς πίστεως· ψυχῆς δὲ, τῆς ἐλπίδος.]

mean the holy mysteries of the catholic church, ye misreport the matter. For, by that exhortation ye speak of, ^a the people are not prepared to receive the communion only, nor chiefly, but to dispose themselves accordingly, and as it becometh them, to pray : for to that end be these words, *Sursum corda*, "Up with your hearts," pronounced by the priest in the preface before prayer. Read St. Cyprian, in *serm.* 6, *De Oratione Dominica*, and ye shall find him to refer the whole to prayer. But what if we admit your words, refusing your heretical meaning? We grant, the people are to good purpose so exhorted, as ye say, and that he is in heaven, whose flesh we feed on in this sacrament, thereby to attain to life everlasting. What conclude ye of this? *ergo*, he is not here? For at that mark ye shoot, every man may see. Here we tell you, that your rhetoric is better stuff than your logic : for your argument is foolish. With the one ye may lead the simple perhaps : with the other ye move the learned to laugh at you. For Christ is in heaven, and also here, as Chrysostom ^b Christ is in heaven by the substance of his body : and here by working, or by grace. saith : *Et hic plenus existens, et illic plenus, unum corpus* : "b He is here fully, and there fully, one body." These two propositions, *Christ is in heaven*, and *Christ is here*, may well stand together without jutting the one the other out of place. He is there at the right hand of the Father visibly : he is here under the forms of bread and wine invisibly : there in glory, here in mystery : yet as truly and fully here as there, concerning his ^c substance, as Chrysostom saith. Ye proceed forth, and say : ^c Untruth. For Chrysostom never neither wrote so, nor meant so.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

It may become you, M. Harding, as well to call the reverend ministration of Christ's holy mysteries a *toy*, as to call the gospel of Christ error and heresy. So likewise Libanius the heathen, although a man, I trow, not of your profession, said sometime, that all the books, either of the scriptures, or of any the Christian fathers, in comparison of Julianus the renegade's books, were *toys* and *trifles*. Howbeit, our *toys* be the same *toys* that were once used and allowed universally throughout the catholic church of God, before your mass was ever known, and were then thought to be no *toys*.

Touching these words, *sursum corda*, "lift up your hearts," ye say, "they were applied in old times unto prayer, and not only or chiefly to the ministration of the sacrament, and that" (as ye seem to say) "by the witness of St. Cyprian." As for these empty words, *only* or *chiefly*,

a Untruth : here M. Harding mis-reporteth his own mass-book.

b Christ is in heaven by the substance of his body : and here by working, or by grace.

c Untruth. For Chrysostom never neither wrote so, nor meant so.

A foolish argument. In Epist. ad Heb. hom. 17. [xii. 168.] Christ is both in heaven, and also here in the sacrament.

Socrat. lib. 3. cap. 19. [leg. c. 22. ii. 199.] Christi-anorum libri ridiculi, et nugaces, si cum Juliani libris conferantur. [ed. Basil. 1549. p. 341.]

ye use them only as a false light to blind your reader. For in our Apology ye found them not.

Touching St. Cyprian, ye thought it best to dissemble, and to shift his words, and to command him in silence. For thus he saith, even directly against the whole practice of your church: *Sacerdos ante orationem, præfatione præmissa, parat fratrum mentes, dicendo, Sursum corda: ut, dum respondet plebs, Habemus ad Dominum, admoneatur, nihil aliud se quam Dominum cogitare debere*: "Before prayer the priest with a preface prepareth the hearts of the brethren, saying unto them, 'Lift up your hearts:' that, when the people answereth, 'We lift them up unto the Lord,' they may be put in mind, to think of nothing else, but of the Lord." Where is this order, M. Harding? where is this ecclesiastical tradition now become? throughout your whole territory of Rome, in what church, in what chapel is it kept? where doth your people answer the priest at the common prayer? or where doth the people understand, either the meaning of the sacraments, or any thing that is pronounced by the priest? or why are you so unadvised, to allege manifest authorities against yourself?

Ye say: "The people was taught by these words, not to consider what was meant only by the sacraments, but to give attendance unto the prayer." Wherein your own Mass-book is easily able to control you. And in the Greek Liturgies, not before any other public prayer, but immediately before the *holy ministration*, the priest saith: "Ἀνῶ σχῶμεν τὰς καρδίας: "Let us lift up our hearts." And Chrysostom saith: *Clamamus in conspectu sacrificii, Sursum corda*: "We cry aloud in the sight of the oblation, 'Lift up your hearts'⁸⁹." St. Augustine saith: *Sursum corda* [al. corde] *habeamus* [al. habitemus]. *Si resurrexistis cum Christo, dicit fidelibus, corpus et sanguinem Domini accipientibus, dicit, Si resurrexistis cum Christo, quæ sursum sunt, sapite: ubi Christus est in dextra Dei sedens: quæ sursum sunt quærite: non quæ super*

Cyprian. in
Oratione Do-
min. [p. 213.]

[Chrys. Lit.
Gr. p. 95.]

Chrysost. ex
varii locis
in Matt.
hom. 9. [il.
991, ed.
1588.]

Augustin. in
Psalm. xxxix.
[iv. 343.]

⁸⁹ [Chrysost. ex Variis loc. in Matt. This work is only extant in Latin, and is not genuine.]

terram : “ *Let us lift up our hearts.* ‘ If ye be risen again with Christ,’ he saith unto the faithful, he saith unto them that *receive the body and blood of our Lord,* ‘ If ye be risen again with Christ, savour those things *that are above,* where Christ is at the right hand of God : seek for *the things that be above* : not for the things that be in earth.” Again he saith : *In sacramentis fidelium dicitur, Ut sursum corda habeamus ad Dominum* : “ At the ministration of the sacraments of the faithful it is said, ‘ *Let us lift up our hearts unto the Lord.*’ ”

Augustin. de
Bono Per-
severan. lib.
2. cap. 13. [x.
839.]

Likewise again : *Inter sacra mysteria cor habere sursum jubemur* : “ In the time of the holy mysteries, we are commanded to *lift up our hearts.* ”

Augustin. de
Bono Vidui-
tatis, cap. 16.
[vi. 380.]

But what need we to rehearse the ancient fathers ? Your own late new doctors have said the like. And to leave the rest, your own Manipulus Curatorum, that is to say, the ordinary and direction of all your whole clergy, saith thus : *Sacerdos ante canonem dicit, Sursum corda : quasi dicat, quod volens sumere istud sacramentum, debet habere cor suum elevatum ad Deum* : “ Before the canon, the priest saith, ‘ *Lift up your hearts* :’ as if he would say, ‘ *Whoso will receive this sacrament, ought to have his heart lifted up unto God.*’ ”

Alexandr.
Halen. 4.
quest. 37.
memb. 1. art.
3. par. 1.

cap. 9. [Ma-
nip. Curat.
fol. 50 b.]

These words be plain, and can in no wise be denied. It were wisdom, M. Harding, in such cases to avouch no more than ye know. Otherwise your words will go for toys.

Howbeit, the matter being granted, *that these words pertain to the holy ministration, yet if we would reason thus* : *Christ’s body is in heaven : therefore it is not really and fleshly in the sacrament* : ye say, “ We should make a foolish argument : our rhetoric is better stuff than our logic.”

This argument, M. Harding, is taken of the nature of Christ’s humanity : which being the very natural body of a man, by the judgment of the ancient fathers, must needs be in one only place at one time, and can reach no further. For otherwise it were not a very natural man’s body. Therefore St. Augustine saith, as he is alleged by Gratian :

De Con. dist. 2. Prima, *Corpus Domini in quo resurrexit, in uno loco esse oportet*

[al. *potest*]⁹⁰: "The body of our Lord, wherein he rose again, *must needs be in one place.*" Likewise again he saith: *Christus secundum præsentiam corporalem, simul et in sole, et in luna, et in cruce esse non potuit*: "Touching bodily presence, *Christ could not be in the sun, in the moon, and upon the cross all at once.*"

Augustin. epist. 221. [ii. 344.]

And again: *Christus ubique est virtute, non opere: Divinitate, non carne*: "Christ is every where by his power, *not in deed*: by his Godhead, *not by his flesh*⁹¹."

Cyrril. in Johan. lib. 9. cap. 23. [iv. 749.]

St. Cyril saith: *Christus cum discipulis suis, etsi non corpore, tamen virtute Deitatis semper futurus est*: "Christ will evermore be with his disciples by the power of his Divinity, although not in his body⁹²." Therefore to conclude, St. Augustine saith: *Videte ascendentem: credite in absentem: sperate venientem: tamen per misericordiam occultam etiam sentite præsentem*: "Behold Christ ascending: believe in Christ being *absent*: trust in Christ that shall come again: and yet by his *privy mercy feel him present.*" Believe, saith St. Augustine, in Christ being now *absent*, and not here.

Augustin. in Psal. xlvii. [iv. 411.]

Thus the ancient catholic fathers were bold reverently to reason of Christ's humanity: yet was not M. Harding yet born, that should so bitterly charge them with *foolish arguments*. Nay rather Ruffinus saith: *Stulta adinventio calumniæ est, corpus humanum aliud esse putare quam carnem*: "It is but a *foolish finding* of a cavil to say, *that the body of a man is any other thing than flesh*⁹³."

Ruffin. in Hier. Inectiva prior. [ap. Hieron. tom. iv. pt. 2. p. 362.]

Chrysost. in Epist. ad Heb. hom. 17. [xii. 168.]

But Chrysostom saith: "Christ is whole here, and whole there." But Chrysostom in the same place many ways expoundeth his whole meaning. For thus he saith, if it would have pleased M. Harding to have seen his words:

⁹⁰ [The reading "oportet" is in Gratian, but in Augustine himself it is "potest." See supra vol. ii. 394, note ⁹¹, and vol. iv. p. 314, note ³⁸.]

⁹¹ [This epistle is from Consentius to St. Augustine.]

⁹² [Cyrill. in Johan. The quo-

tation is from the Lat. ed. Basil. 1546; the Greek simply says: *συνῆν γὰρ αὐτοῖς, καὶ συνέσται διὰ παντός.*]

⁹³ [The "Inectiva prior" is not extant, but some extracts from it have been preserved in the second Invective.]

Offerimus quidem, sed ad recordationem facientes mortis ejus : hoc sacrificium exemplar illius est : hoc (quod nos facimus), in commemorationem fit ejus quod factum est. Idipsum semper offerimus : magis autem recordationem sacrificii operamur : “We offer indeed, but in remembrance of his death. This sacrifice is a *token* or *figure* of that sacrifice. The thing that we do, is done in remembrance of that thing that was done before. *We offer alway the same thing*” (that Christ offered). “Nay rather we work the remembrance of that sacrifice” (that Christ offered)⁹⁴. Notwithstanding, to spare time, this objection is answered more at large in my former Reply to M. Harding.

Art. 6. divis.
8. [Supra vol.
ii. 406.]

But whereas M. Harding saith, “Christ’s body is as fully here as it is in heaven concerning the substance, as Chrysostom saith,” he would under the name of that holy father willfully warrant a great untruth. For Chrysostom saith not, “Christ’s body is present in substance :” he hath no such words : he saith not so : he saith the contrary : as namely where he saith, as it is before alleged : “The very body of *Christ itself* is not in the holy vessels, but the mystery or sacrament thereof is there contained.”

Chrysost. in
Matt. hom.
11. [Op. Imperf. tom. vi.
app. 63.]

Touching these words, unless ye can devise a new grammar, and make *sursum* to be *deorsum*, and, contrary to nature, turn all things upside down, and thus make your construction : *sursum corda* : “*look downward* :” they will but meanly make for your purpose. St. Hierom saith : *Secundus adventus Salvatoris in gloria demonstrandus est. Stultum est ergo illum in parvo aut abscondito loco quærere, qui totius est mundi lumen* : “The second coming of our Saviour shall be declared in glory. Seeing therefore he is the light of the world, *it is great folly to seek him in any small corner*.” Here, M. Harding, St. Hierom saith : “It is great folly to seek Christ, as you seek him.”

Hieronymus
in Matt. cap.
24. [iv. 116.]

⁹⁴ [See the original printed supra vol. ii. 406, note 2.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 14. *Divis.* 3.

[Cyrill.
Anath. 11. ed.
1546. vol. iv.
215.]

Cyrrillus saith, when we come to receive these mysteries, all gross imaginations must quite be banished. [Vol. iv. p. 24.]

M. HARDING.

^a This is a quaint cnst of M. Harding's *copia verborum*.

Why do ye not by your quotation direct us to the place where this saying of Cyril may be found? ^a Know ye not, that we have good cause to suspect your dealing? do we not almost every where find you in manifest lies? if ye mean plain truth, why deal ye not plainly? Christ's saying must needs be true, "Who evil doth, hateth light." Because ye knew the place maketh directly against you, and subverteth your whole sacramentary doctrine, ye thought it good policy to take a word or two for your purpose, and leave the rest, trusting it should not be espied. Wherein ye do like the scorpion, that casteth forth his venom with the spirt of his tail, and forthwith creepeth away into a hole. Would God, as ye abuse the name of Cyril, so ye would stand to the truth, by him (even in that place which ye allege) substantially declared. Who listeth to see the place, let him read Cyril's Answer to Theodoret's reprehension of the eleventh anathematism against Nestorius. There he sheweth, that Nestorius destroyed the mean of the union of both natures in Christ, to the intent the body of Christ might be found but a common body, as men have, and not a body proper of the Word, having power to vivificate or quicken all things. ^b For Nestorius divided Christ, and taught the Word to be the Son of God, not of Mary: and Christ man the Son of Mary only, as man: and dissolved the whole mystery of the incarnation, so as Christ should be another certain Son beside the Word. And because the ^c nature of Godhead cannot be eaten, thereof he talked vainly and profanely, that in the sacrament we eat flesh, and not Godhead. For confutation of this detestable heresy. Cyril bringeth him to the consideration of the blessed sacrament, and opposeth him, whether he thought that in the sacrament, Christ being (by his doctrine) man, besides God the Word, we eat a man, as one would say, after such sort as the barbarous people of the new found land America, called *cannibals*, eat one another. But because that were absurd and beastly, Cyril saith, that we eat not a common body, though the nature of Godhead ^d properly be not eaten, but that body which is *proprium Verbi*, "the proper body of the Word, which quickeneth all things:" by receiving whereof ^e we receive whole Christ, God and man. And here Cyril layeth to Nestorius' charge, as though he drave men to gross cogitations touching this sacrament. The words be these: *Num hominis comestionem*, &c.: "What, dost thou pronounce this our sacrament to be eating of a man," (the Greek is *ἀνθρώπου φαγίαν*,) "and drivest unreve-

Cyrril guilefully alleged.

John v.

The place of Cyril turned upon the defenders.

^b Nestorius' heresy stood neither in transubstantiation, nor in real presence.

^c The meaning is this: We cannot be fed or nourished by Christ, as he is in his divine nature: but only by the faith that we have in his flesh crucified.

^d Untruth: guilefully enclosed: for neither the flesh of Christ in proper speech can be eaten.

^e We receive whole Christ, God and man, not with our mouth, but by faith and spirit.

The heresy of Nestorius.

The gross imaginations that Cyril would to be eschewed in receiving the blessed sacrament.

rently the mind of them as have believed unto gross imaginations, and attemptest with human imaginations to treat of those things which are attained by an only, pure, and exquisite faith?" These be the gross imaginations, which Cyril would to be banished at the receiving of this sacrament, and that we eat the body of Christ, not as being a common body, as the body of every mortal man: and though the nature of Godhead be not eaten, that yet we eat that body which is the proper body of the Word, that ^fwe quickeneth all thing. Now as ^fwe have not that gross imagination of eating a common body (which of the Greeks by a term plainer to the learned is called *ἀνθρωποφαγία*) when we receive this sacrament: so it is evident by Cyril, that in the same ^gwe eat verily and indeed the body of Christ, the Word incarnate. For otherwise his sayings had not made ought against the heresy of Nestorius. And thus receiving Christ's body in the sacrament, we receive it truly, and with faith, and without gross imaginations. All this weighed, how prove ye now Christ to be so lodged in heaven, that notwithstanding his own word, ^hwe lack him here in these holy mysteries? But let us consider your other authorities.

f A fond evasion. For the grossness hereof stood not in Christ's body, but in the manner of eating.
g With our month we receive only the sacrament: with our faith we eat the body of Christ incarnate verily and indeed.
h O fond grossness! We lack not Christ, although we have him not fleshly present in our mouths.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Touching the quotation in the margin, escaped in the print, that fault, I trust, shall be amended. But how will you amend your fault, M. Harding, so often alleging such things as your conscience knoweth to be most untrue? I will not wander far to put you in mind. In the last line of your former division ye avouch that upon Chrysostom, that, you know, Chrysostom never neither wrote, nor meant. As for the *manifest lies*, wherewith ye so sharply and so often charge us, though there were some truth in your challenge, as there is none, yet might not we therein in any wise compare with you. Concerning the affiancing ye would seem to have in these words of Cyril, ye thought it good skill thus to crow out with some courage before the fight.

In what sense *the Godhead may be eaten, or not eaten*, I have already said so much, as then seemed sufficient, in my former Reply to your first Answer. The meaning of Art. 8. divis. 16. [Supra vol. iii. 26.] Cyrillus is this: We cannot neither know, nor believe on, nor feed upon the divine majesty of God, as it is pure, and simple, and in itself: but all our knowledge, and all our faith, which is our spiritual feeding and life, is derived

unto us through Jesus Christ, and standeth only and wholly in this, that the Son of God hath taken the very nature and substance of our corruptible flesh, and joined the same in one person unto his Godhead. Therefore St. Hilary saith: *Cognitus fieri Deus hominibus, nisi assumpto homine, non potuit. Quia incognoscibilem cognoscere, nisi per naturam nostram, natura nostra non potuit*: “God could not be known unto men, but by the receiving of man unto him. For God, that surmounteth all knowledge, our nature could not know, but by the mean of our nature.” So saith St. Augustine: *Quærebam viam comparandi roboris, quod esset idoneum ad fruendum te: nec inveni, donec amplecterer mediatorem Dei et hominum, hominem Christum Jesum*: “I sought a way to get strength, whereby I might be able to enjoy thee: but I found it not, before that I embraced Jesus Christ, which is the Mediator between God and man.” Again he saith: *Christus cibum, cui capiendo invalidus eram, miscuit carni: quoniam verbum caro factum est, ut infantia nostræ lactesceret sapientia tua*: “Christ tempered and mingled his meat” (which is his Godhead) “with his flesh: which Godhead otherwise I was not able to receive. For the Word was made flesh, that thy wisdom, O God, might become milk unto our childhood.”

Nestorius’ heresy stood not either in *transubstantiation*, or in *real presence*: but only in the dissolution of the person of Christ, in that he divided the manhood of Christ from his Godhead: and so concluded in the end, that Christ was only a bare natural man, in all respects as others were. If it had been so, then could we not have been saved by the death of Christ, no more than by the death of Codrus and Decius, who, being nothing else but very natural men, gave themselves to death for the safety of their countries. Neither could we believe in Christ crucified: that is to say, we could not eat nor feed upon the body of Christ, or have life by it. Cyrillus saith: *Quomodo purgabit nos ab operibus mortuis? Sanguis enim communis hominis nihil habet majus quam sanguis tauri, aut hirci*: “How then shall Christ deliver us from deadly works? For the blood of a common man hath nothing more” (to work salvation)

Hilar. in
Psal. cxliii.
[p. 556.]

Augustin.
Confession.
lib. 7. cap. 18.
[1. 142.]

[Ibid.]

Hieron. ad
Ephesios,
cap. 1. [iv.
328.]

Cyrillus ad
Reginas, ex
Epist. ad
Hebræ. [v.
pt. 2. p. 73.]

“than the blood of a *bull*, or a *goat*.” And therefore the same St. Cyril imagineth Christ thus to say: *Mortalem carnem assumpsit: sed quia naturaliter vita existens habito in ea, totam ad meam vitam reformavi*: “I have taken mortal flesh upon myself. But forasmuch as I *naturally*, being life, dwell in the same, *I have reformed that whole flesh unto my life*⁹⁵.” So saith Leo: *Verus venerator Dominicæ passionis, sic crucifixum Jesum oculis cordis aspiat, ut illius carnem suam esse cognoscat*: “Let the true worshipper of our Lord’s passion so behold Christ crucified with the eyes of his heart, that he may understand, that the *flesh of Christ is his flesh*.” But hereof, I trow, M. Harding will move no great question.

Further it is fully confessed of either side, that we by faith eat the very body of Christ, not as the body of any *other common natural man*, but as the *body of the Son of God*: and that the same body so eaten by faith, and none otherwise, giveth life. But how that body may be eaten, therein standeth the whole doubt. Hereunto St. Cyril answereth thus: *Num hominis comestionem hoc nostrum sacramentum pronuntias? et irreligiose ad crassas cogitationes urges mentem eorum qui crediderunt? et attentas humanis rationibus tractare ea, quæ sola, pura, et exquisita fide accipiuntur?* “Dost thou say, that our sacrament is the *eating of a man*? and dost thou unreverently, and without religion, force the mind of the faithful *unto gross*” (and fleshly) “*cogitations*? and goest thou about with natural imaginations to deal those things that be received *by only, pure, and perfect faith*⁹⁶?” These words seem plain, and free from quarrel. Yet hereof may grow another doubt. For by M. Harding’s judgment, to think that Christ’s *body* is to be received into our *mouths and bellies*, is *no manner gross imagination*. But we say, as Cyrillus saith, to avoid all such uncomely and fleshly vanities, Christ’s *body and blood* are a spiritual food, and must be

⁹⁵ [S. Cyrill. in Johan. lib. 4. cap. 18. tom. iv. p. 366. ἔλαβον μὲν γὰρ τὴν ἀποθνήσκουσαν σάρκα, ἀλλ’ ἐπέπερ ἐνφύηκα ταύτῃ, ζωὴ κατὰ φύσιν ὑπάρχων διὰ τὸ ἐκ ζώων

τὸς εἶναι πατὴρ, πᾶσαν εἰς ζωὴν ἀνεστοιχείωσα τὴν ἑμάντου.]

⁹⁶ [This is found only in Latin. Vide supra vol. i. p. 226, note ⁶², and p. 243, note ⁷⁸.]

received, not with *mouth*, or *teeth*, but with *only*, *pure*, and *perfect faith*.

De Con. dist.
2. Ego Be-
rengarius.

Concerning M. Harding's phantasy, pope Nicolas, under a solemn protestation, would have us to say: *Ego corde et ore profiteor, . . . non tantum sacramentum, sed etiam corpus Christi in veritate, sensualiter manibus sacerdotum tractari, frangi, et dentibus fidelium atteri*: "I profess with heart and mouth, that not only the sacrament, but also the body of Christ itself in very truth and indeed is *sensibly touched* and *broken* with the priest's *hands*, and *torn with the teeth of the faithful*⁹⁷." But this talk is so fond, and so utterly void of discretion, that the very *barbarous Gloss* is fain to control it in this sort: *Nisi sane intelligas (ista) verba Berengarii, in majorem incidēs hæresim quam ipse habuit*: "Unless thou wisely understand these words of Berengarius, thou wilt fall into a greater *heresy* than ever he held any."

Sola, pura,
exquisita
fide.

St. Cyril's words be plain: *Sola, pura, et exquisita fide accipiuntur*: "These things be received" (not by mouth, but) "by *only*, *pure*, and *perfect faith*." Likewise again he saith: *Initium et fundamentum in sanctificationem et justitiam Christus est, per fidem, scilicet, et non aliter. Hoc enim modo in nobis habitat*: "Christ is the beginning and foundation unto holiness and righteousness: I mean *by faith* and *none otherwise*. For *by faith* Christ dwelleth in us⁹⁸." So saith Clemens Alexandrinus: *Hoc est bibere Jesu sanguinem, participem esse incorruptionis ejus*: "This is the *drinking of the blood of Jesus*, to be made partaker of his immortality." Origen saith: *Est ergo ipse vulneratus: cujus nos sanguinem bibimus, id est, doctrinæ ejus verba suscipimus*: "He was wounded, *whose blood we drink*, that is to say, *the words of whose doctrine we receive*."

Cyrrill. in Jo-
han. lib. 4.
cap. 29. [iv.
393.]

Clemens in
Pædagogico,
lib. 2. cap. 2.
[i. 177.]

Origen. in
Numer. hom.
16. [ii. 334.]

⁹⁷ ["Ego corde et ore profiteor . . . scilicet panem et vinum quæ in altari ponuntur, post consecrationem non solum sacramentum, sed etiam verum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi esse, et sensualiter, non solum sacramentum, sed in veritate manibus sacerdotum

tractari, frangi, et fidelium dentibus atteri."]

⁹⁸ [S. Cyrrill. in Johan. lib. 4. Ben. ed. tom. iv. p. 393. ἀρχὴ γὰρ ἡμῖν καὶ θεμελίος εἰς ἀγιασμὸν καὶ δικαιοσύνην Χριστός, διὰ πίστεως δὲ δηλονότι, καὶ οὐχ ἐτέρως οὕτω γὰρ ἡμῖν ἐνοικίζεται.]

But what is there so plain, as these words of Athanasius?
Quot hominibus suffecisset corpus ejus ad cibum, ut universi Athan. in illud Evan-
 gelii: Qui-
 cunque dixe-
 rit verbum.
 [i. pt. 2. 710.]
mundi alimonia fieret? Propterea ascensionis sue in cælum
mentionem fecit, ut eos a corporali intellectu abstraheret:
 “Unto how many men could Christ’s body have sufficed
 for meat, that he should be the food of all the world?
 Therefore he made mention of his ascension into heaven:
 that he might withdraw *them from corporal and fleshly*
*understanding*⁹⁹.”

Here, M. Harding, I beseech you, tell us by the way,
 when ye teach us that Christ’s body is *fleshly present*, that
 it is received *into the mouth*, that it is *chewed and bruised*
with teeth, and that it passeth further into the belly, how
 do you withdraw our minds from *fleshly and corpord*
understanding? If this eating be spiritual, what eating may
 be counted corporal? if this be ghostly, what is fleshly?

Hereof St. Augustine saith thus: *Cum videritis Filium* Augustin. in Johan. tract.
 27. [iii. pt. 2.
 502.]
hominis ascendentem ubi erat prius, certe vel tunc videbitis,
quod non eo modo, quo putatis, erogat corpus suum: certe
vel tunc intelligetis, quod gratia ejus non consumitur morsi-
bus: “When ye shall see the Son of man ascending up
 where he was before: then shall ye see, that he giveth not
 his body” (to be eaten) *in such sort as you imagine*: then
 shall ye understand, that his *grace is not consumed by*
morsels.” And therefore again he saith: *Nolite fauces* Augustin. de Verbis Dom.
 secundum Luc. serm.
 33. [v. 566.]
parare, sed cor: “Prepare not your *jaws*, but your *heart.*”

This is the very, true, spiritual, and only eating of
 Christ’s body: and whatsoever phantasy M. Harding hath
 devised besides, *of his mouth and teeth*, is, as St. Cyril
 saith, *a ruin, unreverent, gross, and fleshly imagination.*

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 14. Divis. 4.

The council of Nice, as it is alleged by some in [Mansi. ii.
 888.]
 Greek¹, plainly forbiddeth us to be basely affectioned

⁹⁹ [S. Athan. in “quicunque,” &c. (al. epist. 4. ad Serapion.) Πόσοις γὰρ ἥρκει τὸ σῶμα πρὸς βρώσιν, ἵνα καὶ τοῦ κόσμου παντὸς τοῦτο τροφή γένηται· ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦτο τῆς εἰς οὐ-

ρανὸς ἀναβάσεως ἐμνημόνευσε τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἵνα τῆς σωματικῆς ἐννοίας αὐτοῦς ἀφελεύσῃ κ.τ.λ.]
¹ [Supra vol. ii. 358, note ⁵³.]

or bent toward the bread and wine, which are set before us.

M. HARDING.

As the former part of the sentence, which ye bring out of the Nicene council ^a soundeth nothing against the catholics, (for they also teach the same,) ^a so the latter part is directly contrary to your doctrine, which ye thought good to leave ont, lest thereby ye should have marred your whole matter. Such nipping and rounding of sentences hath ever been taken for a mark to know

^a Untruths, two together. Read the answer.

heretics by. Among wise men such practice worthily bringeth you into suspicion of untruth. The words of the council truly reported be these: "Let us not at the divine table basely behold the bread and cup set before us: but lifting up our mind, let us by faith understand on that holy table to be laid the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world, of priests sacrificed unbloodily. And receiving his precious body and blood verily, let us believe these to be the pledges of our resurrection. For in consideration hereof we take not much, but a little, that we may know, we receive not to filling" (of the body), "but to sanctimony." Take the end with the beginning, and what maketh this decree of that holy council for defence of your sacramentary doctrine? and here, who be more basely affectioned and bent toward the things set on that table, ye that make them but bread and wine, or we, that after consecration, believe under the forms of bread and wine verily to be made present the body and blood of Christ? whether is a baser exercise, to feed on ^b common bread and wine, and to dwell in the judgment of the senses, or to eat the very flesh of Christ, the bread of life that came down from heaven to immortality of the body and soul, to forsake the senses, and follow the understanding of ^c faith? Well we agree with you, not to be over basely intent to the bread and cup. But why do not ye perform that, as followeth there after your own allegation out of that council? why do ye not with those three hundred and eighteen holy fathers, and with the whole church of Christ, understand by faith on that holy table to be laid the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world? why do ye not recant your wicked doctrine against the blessed sacrifice of the mass? Read the whole sentence, joining the end to the beginning. Say not all those holy and learned fathers, "the Lamb of God, on this sacred table" (they mean the altar) "to be sacrificed of the priests unbloodily?" Again, why bring ye the Christian people from the body of Christ whereby they are redeemed, to a ^d bare piece of bread, teaching it to be but the figure of his body? saith not this council, that we receive the precious body and blood of our Lord ^e ἀληθῶς, that is, "verily and indeed," ^f whereby indeed all your tropes and figures be quite excluded? Again, if these were but bread and wine, as ye

A mark to know heretics by. The words of the Nicene council, which make plainly for the catholic doctrine touching the sacrament of the altar.

^b Untruth, vile and slanderous: we feed not upon common bread and wine: we feed upon the very body and blood of Christ.

^c Your faith without God's word is no faith.

^d Untruth. For we teach neither bare bread, nor bare figure. Read the answer.

^e We receive Christ verily and indeed: although neither fleshly nor with bodily mouth.

^f Untruth. For the learned doctors and fathers used commonly the same tropes and figures.

All tropes and figures of the sacramentaries be excluded by the verdict of the Nicene council.

teach, would the council say, that we take them not to satiety, but to sanctimony and holiness? what holiness can we have of bread and wine? what holiness obtain we not by eating of the body of Christ, being the proper body of the Word, or God the Word's own body, that hath power to vivificate and quicken all things? Thus we come within you, defenders, as it were, and clasping with you, wring your ~~g~~ weapon out of your hands, and with the tother end of it strike you down. As it is not hard to us by learning to overthrow you, so we beseech God to strike down the pride and stubbornness of your hearts, as he did Paul, wherewith ye resist the manifest truth.

g O brave captain!

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

We allege this place, although briefly, yet simply and truly, and without any manner fraud or guile. But if "rounding and clipping of the holy fathers be the mark of an heretic," as it is here avouched, then have we one mark more whereby to know M. Harding. For this is his ordinary usage and practice of course.

Touching either the beginning or the end of this decree, there is no cause wherefore any word therein written should of our part be dissembled. The holy fathers in that council teach us, utterly to withdraw our eyes from the bread and wine, being nothing else, but creatures transitory and corruptible: and by faith to behold the very body of Christ, which is represented in the mysteries. To like purpose St. Augustine saith, as it is alleged before:

Ea demum est miserabilis animæ servitus, signa pro rebus accipere: et supra creaturam corpoream oculum mentis ad hauriendum æternum lumen levare non posse: "This is the miserable bondage of the soul, to take the signs instead of the things that be signified: and not to be able to lift up the eye of the mind above the corporal creature, to receive the light everlasting." And therefore immediately before the holy ministration, the priest saith unto us, as it is said before, "Lift up your hearts." In this sort the same fathers speak of the water of baptism: *Baptisma nostrum oculis sensibilibus spectandum non est, sed oculis intellectus. Vides aquam? Cogita vim, et potestatem Dei, quæ in aquis latet:* "Our baptism may not be considered with the sensible or bodily eyes, but with the inner eyes of the mind.

Augustin. de Doctrina Christiana, lib. 3. cap. 5. [iii. 47.]

Concil. Nicen. [ii. 888.] ὕδωρ ὁρᾶς; νόησον τὴν ἐν τοῖς ὕδασι κρυπτομένην τοῦ Θεοῦ δύναμιν.

Seest thou the water? Think of the might and power of God, *that lieth hidden in the water.*" Thus, as in the one sacrament, they withdraw us from the water, even so in the other sacrament, they withdraw us from the bread.

But it followeth in the same decree: "Let us by faith understand, on that holy table to be laid the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world." If the ancient fathers, to the end to stir up and to inflame the hearts of the people, had not sometimes used vehement phrases and extraordinary kinds of speech, M. Harding might many times spare his pen and keep silence. But he doth the fathers great wrong, that presseth only their bare words, and dissembleth their meaning. Gregory Nyssen, St. Basil's brother, discreetly and learnedly openeth this whole matter. Thus he writeth: *Cum in habitudine loci alicujus, vel negotii in loco existentis, intelligibilium aliquod extiterit, abusive id ibi esse dicimus, propter operationem ejus, quæ ibi est, locum pro habitudine et operatione accipientes. Cum enim dicere deberemus, Ibi operatur, dicimus, Ibi est:* "When any spiritual thing is in the consideration of some place, or else in consideration of some matter being in a place, we say, the same spiritual thing is there, by an abuse, or by an extraordinary use of speech: because of the effect of that spiritual thing that there is wrought: taking the place instead of consideration or working in the place. For where we should say, *There it worketh*, thus we say, *There it is.*" Even so where as these fathers should have said, The effects or graces, that we have by Christ's body, are laid before us upon the table, by abuse of speech they say, The body of Christ is laid upon the table. Likewise saith Gratian: *Quidam non improbabili-ter exponunt, carnis et sanguinis veritatem, ipsam corundem efficientiam, hoc est, remissionem peccatorum:* "Some men, not without good reason, by the truth of Christ's flesh and blood, understand the effect or working of the same, that is to say, the remission of sins."

And as these fathers say, "Christ is laid upon the table," even so, by like phrase of speech St. Gregory saith:

De Con. dist. 2. Quid sit. "Christ is killed upon the table:" *Christus iterum in hoc*

Gregor.
Nyssen. de
Anim. cap.
11. [ii. 111.]

De Con. dist.
2. Species.

mysterio moritur : ejus caro in populi salutem patitur :

“ Christ dieth again in this mystery : his flesh suffereth for the salvation of the people.” So saith Chrysostom : *Ut in* Chrysost. in Matt. hom. 4. [Op. imp. vi. app. 42.]
cælo celatur Deus, sic in scripturis absconditur..... Non
omnes intelligunt Deum veritatis, positum in scripturis :

“ As God is covered in heaven, so is he covered in the scriptures. All men understand not God that is laid in the scriptures.” So saith Athanasius : *Est etiam in verbis*

scripturarum Dominus : “ Our Lord is in the words of the scriptures².” So saith St. Hierom : *Supra* [al. *super*]

nudam metuis humum exesa jejuniis membra collidere. Sed
Dominus tecum jacet : “ Thou art afraid to lay thy body, worn out with fasting, upon the bare ground. Yet the Lord lieth there with thee.” Again : *Nudus atque esuriens ante* Athan. de Interpret. Psal. [i. pt. 2. 1002.] Hieronym. de vita Eremitica. [iv. pt. 2. 11.]

fores nostras Christus in paupere moritur : “ Christ naked and hungry, lying before our gate, dieth in the poor.” Hieronym. ad Gauden- tium. [iv. pt. 2. 799.]

And to leave other like sayings and sentences of the ancient fathers, pope Adrian saith in your late council of Nice :

In scripturis sanctarum imaginum Agnus præcursoris digito De Con. dist. 3. Sextam sanctam.
ostensus, depingitur : “ In the scriptures of the holy images, is painted the Lamb of God, that John Baptist shewed with his finger.”

These sayings must be qualified with a gentle exposition : and may not be racked extremely to the sound and rigour of the letter. Chrysostom thus expoundeth these words of St. Paul to the Galatians : *Quibus Christus ante* Chrysost. in Epist. ad Galat. cap. iii. [x. 695.]
oculos prius depictus erat, in vobis crucifixus. Atqui
Christus non apud Galulas, sed Hierosolymis fuit cruci-

fixus. Quomodo igitur dicit, In vobis ? Ut ostendat vim
fidei, quæ potest etiam procul dissita cernere : indicans,
quod illi oculis fidei exactius cernerent, quam nonnulli, qui
præsentibus adfuerant, eaque, quæ gerebantur, conspexerant :
 “ Unto whom Christ was painted out, and crucified among you before your eyes. Yet was not Christ crucified in Galatia, but at Hierusalem. How then saith St. Paul unto the Galatians, *Christ was crucified amongst you ?* His meaning was, to shew the *strength of faith, which is able*

² [Athan. de Interpret. Psalm. γὰρ ἐν τοῖς τῶν γραφῶν ῥήμασιν ὁ
 sive ad Marcellinum Epist. εἶσι Κύριος, κ. τ. λ.]

to see things, though they be far away: and that they, by the eyes of faith, saw the death of Christ more plainly and perfectly, than many that were present at his death, and saw all that was done."

Thus the fathers in this council said, "Christ's body is laid forth upon the communion table," that is, not unto our bodily eyes or senses, but unto the eyes of our faith: I mean by way of a mystery or sacrament: but not verily or indeed. In this sense St. Augustine saith unto the people: *Vos estis in mensa: vos estis in calice*: "You are laid upon the table: you are in the cup." As the people is laid upon the table, so is Christ's body laid upon the table. And as the people is in the cup, so is Christ's blood in the cup. The people is there by way of a mystery: even so is Christ's body and blood there by way of a mystery, and none otherwise. Thus, M. Harding, we withdraw not the people of God, as ye untruly say, from Christ's body to a piece of bread: but rather we lead them, as the ancient fathers ever did, from the creature of bread to the beholding, receiving, and eating of Christ's very body and blood.

In what sort and sense Christ is now unbloodily sacrificed by the priest, for shortness sake, gentle reader, I must refer thee unto my former Reply to M. Harding.

How the holy mysteries be pledges of our resurrection, it hath partly been said before, and partly shall be said hereafter more at large.

How we may receive the body of Christ indeed and verily, without either transubstantiation or real presence, I have both touched before in this treaty, and also in my former Reply. Certainly St. Augustine saith: The receiving of Christ's body indeed, and the receiving of the sacrament, are sundry things. Thus he writeth: *Ostendit Christus, quid sit, non sacramento tenus, sed re vera corpus Christi manducare, et ejus sanguinem bibere*: "Christ sheweth what it is to eat his body and to drink his blood, not by way of sacrament, but verily and indeed." For the eating of the sacrament with mouth and tooth, is not the very true eating of Christ's body: but a token or mystery of the same. St. Augustine saith: *Qui manducat intus,*

De Con. dist.
2. Quia pas-
sus.

Art. 17. divis.
14. [Supra
vol. iii. p.
374.]

Art. 4. [l. 5.]
divis. 8.
[Supra vol.
ii. 361.]

Augustin. de
Civit. lib. 21.
cap. 21. [vii.
646.]

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
26. [iii. pt. 2.
499.]

non foris : qui manducat in corde, non qui premit dente : “He that eateth *within*, not he that eateth *without* : he that eateth” (Christ’s body) “*in his heart*, not he that bruise” (the sacrament) “*with his tooth*.” Whoso by faith receiveth the body of Christ, receiveth it substantially, really, verily, and indeed ; and dwelleth in Christ, and Christ in him. Thus is Christ’s body received, as these holy fathers say, not to the filling or contentation of the body, but unto the holiness and sanctification of the mind.

“Thus ye come within us,” M. Harding, as ye say, “and clasp with us, and overthrow us by learning, and wring our weapon out of our hands, and with the other end thereof ye strike us down.” Methinketh I hear one say, *Denique metuebant omnes jam me.* If some handsome Gnatho stood by you, I trow we should have a pretty play. But unsensible men are we, that feel none of these deadly blows. I will answer you, as St. Augustine sometime answered Pascentius the Arian heretic : *Facile est, ut quisque Augustinum vincat : videris utrum veritate, an clamore :* Thraso in Eunuch. [Act. 3. sc. 1.] “It is an easy matter to overcome Augustine : but see you, whether it be by *truth*, or by *noise of words*.” And again : *Non bonum homini est, hominem vincere : sed bonum est homini, ut eum veritas vincat volentem : quia malum est homini, ut eum veritas vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat, necesse est, sive negantem, sive confitentem :* Augustin. ad Pascent. ep. 174. [ii. 862.] “It is not good for a man to conquer a man : but it is good for a man that the *truth may conquer him with his good will*. For it is ill for a man that the truth should conquer him against his will. But whether he will or will not, *the truth must needs conquer him*.” [Ib. p. 863.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 14. Divis. 5.

And, as Chrysostom very aptly writeth, we say, “that the body of Christ is the dead carcase, and we ourselves must be the eagles :” meaning thereby that we must fly on high, if we will come to the body of Christ. “For this table,” as Chrysostom saith, “is [Chrysost. in 1 Cor. x. hom. 24. tom. x. 276.]

[Cypr. [Arnold.] de Cena Dom. app. p. cxiv.]

a table of eagles, and not of jays³." Cyprian also: "This bread," saith he, "is the food of the soul, and not the meat of the belly⁴."

M. HARDING.

Indeed Chrysostom saith, as ye report. But, sirs, what mean ye? To eat the body of Christ, which is the dead carcase, in respect of his death, (for unless he had fallen, we had not risen again,) must we so be eagles, as we use no office of man's body to this kind of eating? Must we fly so high, as we look not to find this body in earth? can we not eat this body, except we fly up to heaven? can we not come by it, but there? can we not eat him, but there? Yes, forsooth. ^a We need not go out of the earth for the matter. For Chrysostom himself, in the same homily from whence ye fetch this, saith, that whiles we be in this life, this mystery is cause that the ^b earth to us is become heaven. He that desireth to know what eagles we must be, and how high we must fly to come to the eating of this body worthily, let Chrysostom even there expound Chrysostom. "He nameth eagles," saith he, "to shew, that he must get him up on high that cometh to this body, and that he must have nothing to do with the earth, neither be drawn downward to base things, and creep, but always fly upward, and behold the Sun of righteousness," &c. Will ye yet hear him more plainly declare what he meaneth by this high eagle's flight? "Wipe away," saith he, "all filth from thy soul, prepare thy mind to receive these mysteries. If the king's child, arrayed in purple and diadem, were delivered unto thee to bear, wouldest thou not cast down on the ground all that thou holdest, and receive him? But now, when thou receivest not the king's child, ^c but the only begotten Son of God, tell me, I pray thee, art not afraid? and doest not cast away all love of worldly things, and garnish thyself with him only, but doest thou yet look down on the earth? art thou yet in love of thy money? art thou yet given to the earth? If it be so, what forgiveness, what excuse shalt thou find?" This spiritual flying up requireth Chrysostom: and yet in that homily he declareth ^d the body of Christ to be present here in earth, meaning in this holy sacrament, yea that very body which was nailed, beaten, which was not overcome by death, which the sun seeing crucified, turned away his beams, for which the vail of the temple was rent asunder, stones, and all the earth quaked, the body that was made all bloody, and being thrust in with a spear, poured

In 1 Cor. cap. 10. hom. 24. [x. 216.]

What eagles must we be, and how high must we fly, to come to the eating of Christ's body.

What is meant by the high eagle's flight.

Chrysostom acknowledgeth Christ's very body present in the sacrament.

³ [Supra vol. ii. 326, note 24.]

⁴ [Cypr. Arnold. "Quibus sicut corporea nutritur substantia et vivit . . . ita vita spiritus hoc proprio alimento nutritur; et

"quod est esca carni, hoc animæ est fides, quod cibus corpori, hoc verbum spiritui." The words "cibus mentis, non cibus ventris" do not occur there.]

a O earthly divinity! Then have you little to do in heaven.
b Not by pulling Christ down to us: but by lifting up our hearts to him.

c With thy faith, not with thy mouth.

d Untruth. For Chrysostom speaketh only of the presence of grace: of this gross and fleshly presence he saith nothing.

forth fountains of blood and water, to all the world healthful. Thus ye see how far Chrysostom is from your strange doctrine concerning the very and ^ereal presence of Christ's body in the sacrament of the altar. Of which altar, and of the sacrifice of that body made and offered by the priests, and of the adoration due thereto, in that homily he speaketh most plainly. That to prove your purpose, ye must seek for another homily, which ye are never like to find: for Chrysostom serveth not your turn: as neither Cyprian, whom ye allege, and against whom, God knoweth. Verily we confess with holy Cyprian and the fathers of the Nicene council, that the body of Christ which we receive in the blessed sacrament is the food of the soul, and not common meat to fill the paunch. And therefore of the outward forms we take but little, ¹ according to the Nicene decree, acknowledging that spiritual food to serve to sanctimony, not to satiety. Lastly, ye bring for you St. Augustine in these words:

^e Untruth. For Chrysostom not once nameth real presence. Read the answer. ^f Untruth. For the Nicene council maketh no mention of any such forms. And, being but idle forms and shows, how are they a spiritual food, or how can they serve to make you holy?

Cyprian alleged by the defenders to no purpose.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here M. Harding casteth his colours to shadow that thing that will not be hid. Whereas Chrysostom saith, "Thou receivest not the king's child, but the only begotten Son of God," he so racketh and presseth these words, as if the fathers in their writings had never used any kind of figure; and as if we were bound under pain of damnation to receive what sentence soever they have spoken, according to the very rigour and extremity of the letter.

But the better to disclose the sensible grossness of this error, I trust, gentle reader, it shall not be neither painful nor unprofitable for thee to consider a few other such examples and phrases of speech, commonly and familiarly used by the catholic learned fathers to like purpose. Therefore, as Chrysostom saith, "We receive in the holy mysteries the only begotten Son of God," meaning by *faith only*, not by *mouth*, even so he writeth of the sacrament of baptism: *Si quis tibi purpuram aut diadema dedisset, nonne præ quovis auro accepisses? Ego vero tibi non ornatum regium tribuam, sed ipsum regem induendum exhibeo. Et quomodo, inquires, Christum poterit quis induere? Audi quid Paulus dicat: Quotquot in Christum baptizati estis, Christum induitis:* "If any man had given thee a princely robe or a crown, wouldest thou not set more by it than by any gold? But I will give thee, not a princely robe, but *the prince himself*, to put upon thee. Thou wilt

Chrysost. in Epist. ad Coloss. hom. 10. [xl. 402.]

say, How may a man put on Christ upon him? Hear what St. Paul saith: 'As many of you as are baptized in Christ, have put on Christ.' Here Chrysostom teacheth us, that in baptism we receive, not only the king's princely robe, but also the *king himself*. St. Cyril saith: *Discant omnes,ne, antequam firmiores sint catechumeni, Christum eis, antequam oporteat, baptismi mysterio commendat*: "Let all men take heed *that they deliver not Christ*, in the sacrament of baptism, unto the beginners or novices, before they be strong in the faith, and before it be convenient."

Cyril. in Johan. lib. 2. cap. 36. [iv. p. 192. D. E. Lat. ed. tom. i. p. 80.]

Augustin. in Apocalyp. hom. 11. [iii. app. 172.]
Chrysost. de Sacerdot. lib. 3. [i. 383.]

St. Augustine saith: *Sancti..... Christum accipiunt in manu, et in fronte*: "Holy men receive Christ both in their hand and in their forehead⁴." St. Chrysostom saith: *Adest sacerdos, non ignem gestans, sed Spiritum Sanctum*: "The priest is present, bearing not fire, but the *Holy Ghost*⁵."

Ambros. de Josepho Patriarch. [cap. 13. tom. i. 508.]

St. Ambrose saith: *Portant in typo Christi munera: portaturi in evangelio munerum largitorem*: "They carry Christ's gifts in a figure: in the gospel they shall carry" (Christ himself) "*the giver of the gifts*." And again: *.....Mortem non timebis, si geras Christum.....*: "Thou shalt not fear death, if thou bear Christ."

Ambros. de Fuga Seculi, cap. 9. [i. 440.]

Athan. Orat. prima contra Arianos, p. 119. [i. 291.]

Athanasius saith: *Apud nos servatur puerulus ille, quem Herodes interficere satagebat*: "The same child is kept amongst us, whom Herod laboured so earnestly to destroy⁶." St. Chrysostom saith: *Credo [leg. credendum] apostolo Paulo, Christum in se loquentem circumferenti*: "I believe the apostle Paul, carrying Christ about speaking within him."

Chrysost. in 2 Tim. hom. 2. [xi. 669.]

Augustin. de Doctrina Christiana, lib. 4. cap. 16. [ul. 15. iii. 77.]
Cyrillus in Evang. Johan. lib. 3. cap. 34. [iv. 319.]

St. Augustine saith: *Concionatores tradunt Christum discipulis*: "The preachers deliver Christ unto their learners." St. Cyril saith: *Verum manna Christus erat, qui per figuram mannae priscis illis a Deo dabatur*: "Christ was the very true manna, whom under the figure of manna God gave unto the fathers of the old testament." It is written in M. Harding's own legend: *Christophorus por-*

⁴ [This Commentary upon the Apocalypse was erroneously attributed to St. Augustine.]

⁵ [S. Chrysost. de Sacerd. Supra vol. iii. 432, note ²³.]

⁶ [S. Athan. Oratio 1. contra Arianos: this is called by the Bened. Epist. ad Episc. Aegypti et Libyæ.]

tavit Christum in humeris, et in ore per confessionem: Hist. Longobardica, Legendæ 59. [leg. Leg. 95. fol. clxix.]
 “Christopher bare Christ on his shoulders, and he bare Christ in his mouth by his confession.”

Another of his doctors saith: *Christus venditus fuit in Josepho: ligatus in Sampsono: suspensus in botro, et in serpente æneo: crucifixus in Isaaco:* “Christ was sold in Joseph: he was bound in Sampson: he was hanged up in the cluster of grapes, and in the brasen serpent: and he was crucified in Isaac.”⁷

Chrysostom saith: *Quocunque quis pervenerit, Paulum videbit ubique in omnium ore circumferri:* “Whithersoever a man come, he shall see Paul carried about everywhere, in the mouth of every man.” And to end this long rehearsal, St. Augustine saith: *Detractor.....diabolum portat in lingua:* “The slanderer carrieth the devil upon his tongue.”⁸

I doubt not but M. Harding will better bethink himself, and not require us to take all these sayings without any manner of favourable exposition, barely and nakedly as they lie. Otherwise he must needs encumber himself with a great number of inconveniences.

Of these phrases and manners of speech St. Augustine giveth his judgment in this sort: *Omnia significantia videntur quodammodo earum rerum, quas significant, sustinere personas:* “All signs or tokens seem in a manner to bear the persons of the things themselves that they signify.” As for example, he saith: *Sicut dictum est ab apostolo, Petra erat Christus: quoniam petra illa, de qua hoc dictum est, significabat Christum:* “So the apostle saith, ‘The rock was Christ:’ for that the rock, whereof it was spoken, signified Christ.”

Likewise Athanasius saith: *Qui regis imaginem videt, regem videt, et dicit: En tibi regem. Neque tamen duos reges constituit: neque imaginem particulam esse regis, neque regem particulam imaginis esse judicat:* “He that seeth the image of a king, seeth the king, and saith, Behold

⁷ [Fortalitium fidei. See this passage printed correctly, supra vol. iii. p. 426, note 20.]

⁸ [The work de Salutaribus Documentis is not St. Augustine's.]

there is the king. And yet" (so saying) "he maketh not two kings: nor thinketh he, either that the image is a parcel of the king, or that the king is parcel of the image⁹."

Gregor. in
Joh. lib. 20.
cap. 28. [leg.
cap. 38. tom.
i. p. 948.]

St. Gregory in plainer wise saith thus: *Eundem Agnum Johannes ostendendo, Esaias prævidendo, Abel offerendo loquutus est, et quem Johannes in ostensione, quem Esaias in loquutione, hunc Abel significando in manibus tenuit*: "John the Baptist by pointing with his finger, Esaias by foreseeing, Abel by offering, spake all three of one Lamb. And Abel by signifying, held the same Christ in his hands, whom John held by pointing, and whom Esaias held by prophesying." Again he saith: *Intus ad Christum respicit, quem per considerationem portat in corde*: "Inwardly he beholdeth Christ, whom by meditation he beareth in his heart."

Gregor. in 1
Regum lib.
2. cap. 2.
[leg. cap. 3.
tom. iii. 92.]

Such amplifications, and vehement and extraordinary speeches, notwithstanding in some cases they may be dangerous, yet oftentimes they seem necessary, the better to quicken the dulness and negligence of the people. And therefore Chrysostom saith: "Behold, *the Lamb of God is slain: the blood even now is drawn from his side*: and the whole people is coloured and made red and bloody with the same." Not for that it was so indeed: but to lift up and to withdraw the hearts of the people from the outward corruptible creatures of the bread and wine, to a spiritual and mystical understanding, that is to say, to the eating and drinking of the very body and blood of Christ. And to that end he saith: *Aquilas appellat, ut ostendat, ad alta eum oportere contendere, qui ad hoc (corpus) accedit*: "He calleth us eagles, to shew, that he must mount on high and flee aloft, whoso will approach near to that body." Like-

Chrysost. in
1 Cor. hom.
24. [x. 216.]

Chrysost. ad
Popul. Antio-
chen. hom.
61. [ed. 1588.
tom. v. 342.]

wise he saith: *In cælum vocat nos, ad magni regis mensam*: "Christ calleth us up into heaven, unto the table of the great King." And again: *Illum sursum sedentem.....*

⁹ [S. Athan. contra Sabellii Gre-gales. This book the Bened. shew to have been erroneously attributed to St. Athanasius, being nearly identical with St. Basil's 24th ho-

mily, contra Sabellianos, Arium et Anomæos: in which (Opp. ii. 192) corresponding words will be found.]

hic [al. *hunc*] *degustamus*: "We, being here beneath, taste him sitting in heaven above¹⁰." So saith St. Hierom: *Ascendamus cum Domino in cœnaculum magnum, stratum, atque mundatum: et accipiamus ab eo sursum calicem Novi Testamenti*: "Let us ascend up with our Lord into that great dining chamber, adorned and made clean: and there above let us receive of him the cup of the New Testament."

So saith St. Augustine: *Ubi fuerit corpus, illuc congregabuntur aquilæ, id est, in cœlum:..... Illuc congregabuntur aquilæ: dictum est de spiritualibus, qui ejus passionem, humilitatemque imitando, tanquam de ejus corpore saturantur*: "Where as the carcass shall be, thither shall the eagles resort together, that is to say, into heaven: thither shall the eagles resort together: this is spoken of the spiritual faithful men, that, following his passion and humility, be filled, as it were, with his body."

So saith Leo: *Circa hoc corpus aquilæ sunt, quæ alis circumvolant spiritualibus*: "About this body there are eagles, that flee about with spiritual wings."

Thus are the faithful made *eagles*: thus is the *earth become heaven*: not for that Christ's body is pulled down, as M. Harding imagineth, but for that our minds and affections be lifted up. For so Chrysostom himself expoundeth his own meaning: *Hodie nobis terra facta est cœlum, non stellis de cœlo in terram descendentibus, sed apostolis ad cœlum ascendentibus. Quia effusa est copiosa gratia Spiritus Sancti: et universum orbem operata est cœlum: non immutans naturam, sed voluntatem emendans*: "This day the earth is made heaven; not by the stars coming down upon the earth, but by the going up of the apostles into heaven. For the abundant grace of the Holy Ghost is poured out, and hath turned the whole world into heaven, not by changing of nature, but by correcting the will of man¹¹." Likewise again he saith: *Apostoli in terra constituti, in cœlo conversabantur. Et quid dico, in cœlo? Al-*

¹⁰ [There are only 22 genuine homilies ad Pop. Antioch.]

¹¹ [This homily in Pentecostem

is declared by the Bened. spurious, and by Saville admitted to be doubtful.]

Hieronym.
ad Hedibian,
[iv. 172.]

Augustin.
Quest. Evan-
gel. lib. i. cap.
42. [iii. pt. 2.
247.]

De Conc. dist.
2. In quibus.

Chrysost. in
hom. de Pen-
tecost. [iii.
787.]

Chrysost. ad
Hebræos,
hom. 16.
[xii. 162.]

tiores erant cælo: etiam alio cælo: et ad ipsum Dominum pervenerunt: "The apostles dwelling in the earth, had their conversation in heaven. But what say I, in heaven? They were higher than heaven, yea than the second heaven: and came even unto the Lord himself." Again he

Chrysost. de Penitent. hom. 6. [ed. 1588. tom. v. p. 742.]

Chrysost. in 1 Cor. hom. 24. [x. 218.]

saith: *David terram in cælum vertit: et homines facit angelos:* "*David turneth the earth into heaven:* and of men he maketh angels." Again he saith in this selfsame place by M. Harding alleged: *Ut terra nobis cælum sit, facit hoc mysterium. Ascende igitur ad cæli portas, et diligenter attende: imo non cæli, sed cæli colorum: et tunc quod dicimus intueberis:* "This mystery causeth, that unto us the earth is heaven. *Ascend up therefore unto the gates of heaven:* and mark diligently. Nay, I say not, unto the gates of heaven: but, *unto the gates of the heaven of heavens.* And so shalt thou see the things that I tell thee."

Now judge thou, good Christian reader, how true it is, and how agreeable with St. Chrysostom's doctrine, that M. Harding saith: "Must we flee so high, that we look not to find this body in earth? Can we not eat this body, except we flee up into heaven? Can we not come by it, but there? Can we not eat him, but there? Yes, forsooth: we need not go out of the earth for the matter." If it be so, then may you rest in the earth, and tarry there still, and never trouble your eyes to look up to heaven.

Verily Chrysostom, when he saith, "We receive the Son of God," maketh mention neither of transubstantiation, nor of real and fleshly presence, nor of eating with mouth or teeth, but only sendeth us to the force and working of faith and spirit: whereby only, and by no way else, we receive and eat indeed and verily the body of Christ.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 14. *Divis. 6.*

In Johan. tract. 50. [iii. pt. 2. 630.]

And St. Augustine saith: "How shall I hold him, being absent? How shall I reach my hand up to heaven, to lay hold upon him sitting there?" He answereth: "Reach thither thy faith, and then thou hast laid hold on him." [Vol. iv. p. 24.]

M. HARDING

John xi. 57. Upon these words of St. John, "The bishops and pharisees gave commandment, that if any knew where Jesus were, he should shew it, that they might apprehend him," St. Augustine, expounding the same in a contrary sense, saith: "Let us now shew the Jews where Christ is: would God they would hear, and lay hold on him." Where he speaketh not of receiving Christ, so as we receive him in the sacrament, ^a but of receiving him by faith only. And there he wisheth and exhorteth the Jews to come to the faith, and teacheth them how they may profitably lay hold on Christ, whom their forefathers laid hold on with violent hands to their damnation. "Let them come to the church," saith he, "let them hear where Christ is, and lay hold on him." After certain words he maketh this objection to himself: "Well, the Jew answereth me, Whom shall I hold? him that is absent? How shall I reach up my hand to heaven, that I may lay hold on him which sitteth there?" "Reach thither thy faith," saith Augustine, "and then thou hast laid hold on him." Then followeth in the same line that which plainly declareth all this to be meant of laying hold on Christ by faith, ^b not by receiving the communion: *Parentes tui tenuerunt carne; tu tene corde*: "Thy forefathers, thou Jew, took hold on Christ in flesh: take thou hold on him in thy heart." There he sheweth how Christ may be holden, though (concerning the visible and sensible presence of his body) he be in heaven at the right hand of the Father. All this, and whatsoever is said there upon the text before recited, implieth not so much as any colour of argument against the truth of Christ's very body in this most blessed sacrament. And thus all your allegations and reasons concerning this matter be sufficiently answered.

^a And by faith only we receive Christ in the sacrament.

^b He speaketh not of the receiving of the sacrament, but he speaketh of the receiving of the very body of Christ, which is wrought only by faith.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

It is true that M. Harding saith: "St. Augustine in this place speaketh nothing of purpose and specially of the sacrament." Certainly it had been great vanity for him to will his hearers to seek for the sacrament in heaven above. But he speaketh of the embracing and holding the very body of Christ, being now in heaven. Which thing is wrought only by faith, and none otherwise, whether it be in the sacrament, or without the sacrament. Infinite sentences have been uttered by the holy fathers to like purpose.

St. Augustine saith: *Accedite ad eum, et illuminamini*: ⁹ [viii. 40.]

Augustin, adversus Iudeos, cap. 9 [viii. 40.]

quid est, accedite, nisi credite? "Come unto him, and receive the light: what is, *come* unto him, but, *believe* in him?" Again: *Ambulando non laborabitis: ibi enim acceditis, ubi creditis*: "Your walking shall not be painful to you: for there ye *come* to him, where ye *believe* in him."

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
48. [iii. pt. 2.
618.]

Again he saith: *Exiit de manibus eorum: non enim apprehendere eum potuerunt, quia manus fidei non habuerunt*: "Christ departed out of their hands: for they could not lay hold on him, because they had not *the hands of faith*." Again: *Christus non recte tangitur: id est, non recte in eum creditur*: "Christ is not *well touched*: that is to say, Christ is not well *believed*." Likewise again he

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
121. [iii. pt. 2.
808.]

Augustin. de
Natura et
Gratia, cap.
69. [x. 164.]

Ambros. [leg.
Maxim.] ser.
58. [ed. Frob.
iii. 284.]

saith: *Sunt in corde spirituales manus*: "There be certain *spiritual hands* in the heart." And therefore St. Ambrose saith: *Stephanus in terris positus, Christum tangit in cælo*: "Stephen being in the earth," (by faith) "*toucheth Christ* being in heaven ¹²."

Ambros. in
Luc. lib. 10.
cap. 24. [i.
1537.]

Ambros. in
Luc. lib. 6.
cap. 8. [i.
1397.]

But, as St. Augustine so often saith, "We embrace and hold Christ by faith;" so is not M. Harding able to shew that he ever once said, we hold Christ with *mouth* or *teeth*, or receive him down into *our bellies*. And therefore St. Ambrose saith: *Non corporali tactu Christum, sed fide tangimus*: "We touch not Christ by bodily touching; but we touch him by faith." And again: *Fide Christus tangitur: fide Christus videtur: non corpore tangitur: non oculis comprehenditur*: "By faith Christ is touched: by faith Christ is seen: he is not touched with our bodies: he is not holden with our eyes." Likewise St. Augustine saith: *Dominus consolatur nos, qui ipsum jam in cælo sedentem manu contrectare non possumus: sed fide contingere* (*possumus*): "The Lord comforteth us, that cannot now touch him with hand, sitting in heaven: but by faith we may touch him."

Augustin. in
Epist. Johan.
tract. 1. [iii.
pt. 2. 828.]

Now, forasmuch as M. Harding saith, "St. Augustine in this place maketh no mention of the receiving of Christ's body in the sacrament," it shall not be from the purpose

¹² [St. Ambrose; rather Maximus: see note ¹⁰, supra vol. ii. 418.]

to consider, what he hath written otherwheres touching the same. Thus he saith: *Christus est cibus noster, quo nihil dulcius: sed si quis habeat palatum sanum in corde:* Augustin. in Johan. tract. 7. [iii. pt. 2. 342.] “Christ himself is our meat, than which meat there is nothing more savoury, so that a man have a *sound taste in his heart.*” Again he saith: *Dominus dixit se panem, qui de cælo descendit, hortans ut credamus in eum. Credere enim in eum, hoc est manducare panem vivum. Qui credit in eum manducat: invisibiliter saginatur, quia invisibiliter renascitur. Infans intus est: novus intus est: ubi novelatur, ibi satiatur:* “Our Lord called himself the bread that came from heaven, exhorting us to *believe in him.* For to believe in him, that is to eat the bread of life. He eateth, that believeth in him. He is fed invisibly, because he is new-born invisibly. Inwardly he is an infant: inwardly he is new. Where he is renewed, there is he filled.”

So saith Eusebius Emisenus, as he is alleged by Gratian: *Cum ad...reverendum altare cælestibus cibis satiandus accedis, sacrum Dei tui corpus et sanguinem respice, honora, mirare, mente continge: cordis manu suscipe: et maxime haustu interiori assume:* De Cons. dist. 2. Quia corpus. “When thou comest unto the reverend altar” (or communion table) “to be fed with the heavenly meats, behold the holy body and blood of thy God: honour it: wonder at it: *touch it*” (not with thy bodily mouth, but) “*with thy mind*: receive it” (not with thy bodily hand, but) “*with the hand of thy heart*: and specially take it with thy *inner taste.*”

Therefore St. Augustine saith:..... *Quisquis cum fide et timore verbum Dei audis, consolatur* [al. *consoletur*] *te fractio panis. Absentia Domini non est absens* [al. *absentia*]. *Habeto fidem: et tecum est, quem non vides.....Ideo Dominus absentavit se corpore ab omni ecclesia, et ascendit in cælum, ut fides ædificetur:* Augustin. feria 2. Paschatis, serm. 1. [tom. v. 990.] “Whosoever thou be, that with faith and fear hearest the word of God, the breaking of bread doth comfort thee. *The absence of our Lord is not absent.* Have thou faith: and he whom thou seest not is with thee. Therefore our Lord, *as touching his body, hath absented himself from all his church,* and is ascended into heaven, that our faith may be edified.” Christ absent from all his church.

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
50. [iii. pt. 2.
630.]

And in this selfsame place, that M. Harding saith maketh so little for our purpose, he saith thus: *Quomodo tenebo absentem? Quomodo in cœlum manum mittam, ut ibi sedentem teneam? Fidem mitte, et tenuisti. Parentes tui tenuerunt carne: tu tene corde. Quoniam Christus absens, etiam præsens est. Nisi præsens esset, a nobis ipsis teneri non posset. Sed quoniam verum est quod ait, Ecce ego vobiscum sum usque ad consummationem sæculi, et abiit, et hic est: et rediit, et nos non deseruit. Corpus enim suum intulit cœlo: majestatem autem non abstulit mundo: "How shall I hold Christ, being absent? How shall I thrust my hand into heaven, that I may hold him sitting there? Send up thy faith, and thou holdest him. Thy fathers" (the Jews) "held him in flesh: hold him thou in thy heart. For Christ being absent, is also present. Unless he were present, we could not hold him. But forasmuch as it is true that he saith, 'Behold, I am with you until the end of the world,' therefore he is gone, and yet is here. He is come again, and hath not forsaken us. For he hath advanced his body into heaven: but he hath not withdrawn his majesty from the world."*

All these things well considered, whereas M. Harding in the end concludeth with these words: "Thus all your allegations and reasons concerning this matter be sufficiently answered:" I doubt not, but his discreet and indifferent reader will think he crew long before it was day.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 15. Divis. 1.

Neither can we away in our churches with these shows, and sales, and markets of masses, nor with the carrying about and worshipping of the bread; nor with such other idolatrous and blasphemous fondness: which none of them can prove, that Christ or his apostles ever ordained or left unto us. And we justly blame the bishops of Rome, who, without the word of God, without the authority of the holy fathers, without any example of antiquity, after a

[Vol. iv. p.
24.]

new guise, do not only set before the people the sacramental bread to be worshipped as God, but do also carry the same about upon an ambling palfrey, whithersoever themselves journey: in such sort, as in old times the Persians' *fire* and the relics of the goddess Isis were solemnly carried about in procession: and have brought the sacraments of Christ to be used now as a stage play, and a solemn sight: to the end, that men's eyes should be fed with nothing else, but with mad gazings and foolish gauds, in the selfsame matter wherein the death of Christ ought diligently to be beaten into our hearts, and wherein also the mysteries of our redemption ought with all holiness and reverence to be executed.

In Ceremoniarum Rom. Eccl. lib. 1. sect. 12. c. 1. fol. 119. ed. 1572.]

M. HARDING.

..... The things which it liketh your Satanical spirit with blasphemous words to ^adishonour and bring in contempt, are such as neither your praises can make more praiseworthy, nor your upbraidings any whit of less estimation. If any, by the stinking breath of your vile words, be puffed away into your damned side, whosoever they be, they shew themselves to have been light chaff, not sound wheat. Yet, for good folks' sake, that I may leave your vile eloquence to yourselves, and answer the matter by you railed at, and belied, and otherwise not disproved; I pray you, good sirs, the ^b mass being the highest and most honourable service that is done to God in his church, (which otherwheres being already proved, I treat not of in this place,) why should not a priest, by whom only it is and may be done, ^c being called to that vocation, or state of life, have reward and living for it ¹³? Rail against the mass, and priests serving at the altar of God, until your tongues burn in your head in hell fire: we tell you, priests of the catholic church sell ^d not the fruit and merit of Christ's blood offered in the mass: but only for their ministry and labour require necessary sustenance of life.

^a Untruth. For we honour the holy mysteries: and you profanely dishonour them.

^b Untruth. For as it is now used, there is no viler dishonour, nor greater blasphemy.

^c Untruth. For Christ never called his disciples, or sent them abroad to say mass.

^d Alas, they have it not. Otherwise for money it should away.

Matt. iii. 12.
Luke iii. 17.

A priest may justly enjoy his necessary living for serving at the altar, and for saying mass.

But for your Defence, ye confess, that ye cannot away with the carrying about and worshipping of bread: no more cannot we.

¹³ [Here Harding argues at length for the maintenance of the clergy.]

e God forbid
there should
be water in
the sea.

f Untruths,
and most
fond and
blasphemous
follies.

g Yet not one
of your ca-
tholic pre-
lates amend-
eth them.
h Untruth,
fond and
heathenish.
for God him-
self saith, In
vain they
worship me.

i Untruths,
four toge-
ther: for he
dishonoureth
Christ. He
hath neither
God's word,
nor the au-
thority of all
the fathers,
nor the ex-
amples of an-
tiquity.

k Note, that
in the same
one little ar-
ticie M. Hard-
ing hath sent
us twelve
great un-
truths.

l Untruth.
For this is
only the sa-
crament of
that same
body.

m Doth M.
Harding scoff
at these
games, or
speaketh he
in earnest?
n Why should
a wise man
speak so
fondly? Read

To whose charge lay ye this? Be there any such idolaters now, ^e God forbid we that worship bread? They would be known. ^e God forbid we should suffer idolaters to live amongst us. Soothly in the catholic church we know none. If ye cannot away with the honour which ^f all devout Christian people do to the ^f blessed sacrament, (we mean, to Christ's body and Christ himself ^f present in substance under ^f the form of bread,) then cannot we take you for Christians. Mock, scoff, jest, and rail at us with the Jews, we dare not but honour our Lord Christ, wheresoever our faith findeth him verily and in substance present ¹⁴.....

We know no
worshippers
of bread.

If through fervent zeal (as sometimes it happeneth) abuses in certain places have crept in, no good catholic man ^g defendeth them. Marry we know all is not to be abrogated that misliketh your corrupt taste. ^h And much is right holy devotion, pleasant in the sight of God, and therefore allowed in the church, which your hot spirit calleth idolatrous and blasphemous fondness. And though the ceremony and manner, whereby such devotion is shewed, cannot be proved by ordinance of Christ, or of the apostles, expressed in scripture, yet Christian people doubt not, but God accepteth their good hearts.....

The bishop of Rome ye blame unjustly, I might say also proudly. For procuring ⁱ honour and worship to Christ in the blessed sacrament, he hath the ⁱ word of God, ⁱ the authority of all holy fathers, and ⁱ the examples of antiquity, as ^k I have at large proved in my Answer to your companion Master Jewel his eighth negative article. But the ambling horse offendeth you. Why be ye not also offended with the ass and her foal, that bare the ^l same body at Jerusalem, which the horse beareth at Rome; then visible and weighty; now invisible, and of no weight? That was done in pomp to the honour of Christ, and so is this. Ye say, this is done after a new guise. So then was that..... Neither is it true which ye say, that the bishops of Rome do carry about with them the sacrament whithersoever they journey.

^m Ye might have learned in that book, out of which ye allege that matter to scoff at, that such a solemnity is used specially when the pope rideth in *pontificalibus*. Then (as the book telleth) a white palfrey, trapped, gentle, and fair, with a clear sounding bell hanging at his neck, is led, which carrieth the monsternce, or pyx, with the most holy body of Christ, over the which noble citizens shall bear a canopy. Thus the book of ceremonies.....

ⁿ And I pray you, what evil is this? If it be good to carry about that most holy body, by which as Christ once redeemed us, so by the same, devoutly honoured of faithful people, and carried abroad, and brought to certain places, hath in old times, (as yet also doth continually,) to the great comfort and help of sundry

Lib. Ceremoniarum Eccl. Rom. 12. cap. 1. [fol. 119.] Baldachinum.

¹⁴ [Harding here alludes to Corpus Christi day, as founded by Urbanus IV.]

persons being in distress, wrought miraculously healthful remedies :.....if the Israelites found help at God's hand by ^o bringing the ark into the field with them, as they marched forward against the Philistines : if the Philistines cried out for fear, when they perceived the ark to be in the Israelites' army, and said : *Veni Deus in castra. Væ nobis* : " God is come into their tents. Alas, we are undone," &c.

1 Sam. iv. 5.

1 Sam. iv. 7.

^o They did it against God's will, and sped thereafter. Read the answer.

In the order of this ceremony nothing appear-eth to a Christian man unseemly or unreasonable.

And concerning the order of the ceremony, whereas the people be desirous to behold the body of their Redeemer with their faith by their carnal eye directed to the form of bread, no man is able to hold up on high the sacrament, so as convenient it were to be done, both to satisfy their devotion, and to maintain their faith : for the pope himself commonly is an aged man, and therefore over weak ^q for that service, specially arrayed in pontificalibus, as in such solemnities he is. Again, the instrument that serveth for that purpose is so great and weighty, (for so it appertaineth to the honour of Christ,) the way so long, the air for the more part there so hot, as no other man is well able, for lack of strength, to bear it so as meet it is to be borne. In this case ^r why may not a horse be put to that service, to supply that, which by natural weakness faileth in man ? Wherein he serveth not as one that beareth a mail, but as the ass that bare Christ, as the kine that drew the ark.

^p Grave considerations.

^q A horse supplieth the pope's office.

The custom of carrying the sacrament where the pope goeth is neither new, nor strange.

Neither ought the custom of bearing the most holy body of Christ where the pope goeth to, seem new and strange : for we read in the life of the blessed martyr Stephen the First, who was pope of Rome above thirteen hundred years past, that Tharsitius the deacon (who at length also suffered death for Christ) bare our Lord's body, at what time he attended upon the blessed man pope Stephen, as he went to his martyrdom. Who desireth to see this described at large, the same may he find in (*that great fond fabular* ¹⁵) Simeon Metaphrastes a Greek writer, well approved, and highly esteemed in the Greek church, in *Vita Stephani Primi*.....

For witness whereof we have St. Ambrose, who describeth, how certain faithful persons carried ^s this blessed sacrament with them when they went to the sea, of whom his brother Satyrus obtained the same in a shipwreck, and by help thereof, hanging it in a stole about his neck, seeking for none other succour, cast himself into the sea, and miraculously escaped safe to land..... Neither is the same by him done without a special mystery, though unknown to the more part. " Although," saith a learned pope, " a reason cannot be given of all things, whatsoever have been brought in ure by our forefathers : yet I think," quoth he, " that therein lie hidden profound mysteries."

I report me now to the secret consciences of good Christian people, whether the bishops of Rome use not the blessed sacra-

^r It was a great abuse of the sacrament : and yet without either pyx or pomp, and therefore was afterwards taken away throughout the whole church of God.

^s If ye had not these games from thence, then tell us from whence ye had them.

¹⁵ [The words between brackets are Bishop Jewel's.]

ment reverently and honourably, or no, but rather ^tas the Persians' fire, and the relics of the goddess ^{is}, as a stage play, mad gazings, and foolish gauds, as it liketh this wicked Chams-brood to rail. Wherein they follow the steps which Julian the apostata, Lucian, Porphyrius, Celsus, and such other profane hell-hounds have trodden before them. For after the like manner they railed at the holy mysteries of Christian religion, namely Celsus, who, as Origen writeth of him, objected to the Christians the sacrifices of Mithra, (which was an idol that the Persians worshipped, and called it the *sun*,) from whence he said they had taken ail their sacraments, rites, and ceremonies. And right so (as we find in St. Augustine writing against the Manichees) the Paynims found fault with the Christian people for "honour done to the "body and blood of Christ under "forms of bread and wine, saying that they honoured Bacchus and Ceres.

t Most vain untruths. For St. Augustine speaketh neither of adoration, nor of Christ's body, nor of forms.

This defend-er followeth Julian, Lucian, Porphyrius, Celsus, and such other wicked infidels. Contra Celsum, lib. 6. de Mithra: vide Suidam in dictione.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Concerning these *Satanical spirits, and stinking breaths, and vile words*, and such other like flowers of your eloquence, M. Harding, I confess myself to be far inferior, and never able to make you answer. It is true that ye say, "The workman is worthy of his hire." St. Paul saith: "The Lord hath appointed, that whoso preacheth the gospel should live by the gospel." But where did Christ ever say unto you, "Go into all the world, and say private mass, and offer me up unto my Father for remission of sins?" what apostle, what prophet, what doctor, what father ever taught you so to do? If ye set yourself a work without commission, and run forth when no man biddeth you, then are ye your own men: and of reason ought to pay yourselves.

If your masses, as you say, "were never set to open sale," wherefore then was this decree written in the council of Oxford: *Venalitatem missarum districte inhibemus*: "We straitly forbid the sale of masses?" Think you, that so many wise fathers would forbid that thing that never was used? In the late conference holden at Worms, the bishop of Sidon, being there present, durst not say, as you dare say, there was no such unlawful sale, but only said, "It was out of season to talk thereof." His words be these: *Quid attinebat de missis venalibus, de mercatu indulgentiarum, &c. mentionem intempestivam inducere?*

Constitut. Othonis Legat. fol. 143. [Const. Prov. Concil. Oxon. p. 12.]

In Colloquio Woormatien. consensu §.

“What was it to the purpose, to speak of the *selling of masses and pardons*, out of season¹³?”

“The priests,” ye say, “of the catholic church sell not the fruit and merit of Christ’s blood.” No marvel: for they have it not to sell. But if ye had Christ himself, ye would set him to sale, as other your fathers have done before you. Such a one was he, of whom St. Gregory writeth: *Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum hæretico, accepta pecunia, venundedit*: “He took money, and sold *Jesus Christ our Lord* unto an heretic.” And when the bishop of Rome selleth his pardons, what other thing would he seem to sell, but only the fruits and merits of the blood of Christ?

Gregor. lib. 2, epist. 33. [tom. ii. 612.]

Ye say further: “God forbid, we should suffer idolaters to live amongst us.” And yet your near friends have thought, ye have not been far from the maintenance of idolatry. Polydorus Virgilius, entreating of the worshipping of images, saith thus: *Eo insanie decentum est, ut hæc pars pietatis parum differat ab impietate*: “They are so far proceeded in madness, that *this part of holiness is not far from wickedness*.” And Ludovicus Vives saith, he seeth no great difference between certain Christians worshipping their images, and the old heathens adoring their idols.

Polydor. de Inventorib. Rer. lib. 6. cap. 13.

Ye say: “The carrying about of the sacrament is right holy devotion, pleasant in the sight of God: and Christian people doubt not, but God accepteth their good hearts.” Even so, no doubt, as when he said sometime unto the Jews, *Quis requisivit ista de manibus vestris?* “Who required these things at your hands?”

Isa. i. 12.

St. Augustine saith: *Socratis sententia est, Unumquemque deum sic coli oportere, quomodo se ipse colendum esse præceperit*: “The judgment of Socrates is this, That every god ought so to be worshipped, as *he himself hath commanded*.” Again he saith: *Constat, fidem stultam non solum minime prodesse, sed etiam obesse*: It is certain,

Augustin. de Consent. Evangelist. lib. 1, cap. 18. [iii. pt. 2. 12.]

Augustin. in Quest. ex Veteri Test. quest. 43. [iii. app. 56.]

¹³ [The Editor has not succeeded in finding the work referred to. In the Colloquium Wurmaciens.

Wittemb. 1542, there is no speech of the bishop of Sidon.]

that a *foolish faith* not only doth not good, but also hurteth ¹⁴.”

Chrysost. in
Act. hom. 49.
[ix. 366.]

Chrysostom saith : *Tales sunt diabolo venandi artes : qui prætextu pietatis laqueos tegit* : “Such sleights of hunting hath the devil : under the colour of holiness he hideth his snares.”

But as touching the solemnity of carrying the sacrament, your own doctor Gabriel Biel could have told you :

Gabr. lect. 26.
[leg. 36. fol.
lxxxiii. col.
4.]

Christus non dedit discipulis sacramentum, ut ipsum honorifice conservarent : sed dedit in sui usum, dicens, Accipite, et manducate : “Christ gave not the sacrament to his disciples to the end *they should keep it with honour* : but he gave it to them for their use, saying to them, ‘*Take and eat.*’” Likewise saith Humbertus : *Christus non tantum benedixit panem, et reservavit frangendum in crastinum : nec fregit tantum, et reposuit, sed fractum statim distribuit* : “Christ did not only bless the bread, and reserve it to be broken the next day : nor did he only break it, and lay it up : but being broken, straightway he delivered it.”

Citatur a
Cassandro
in Liturgiis.
[cap. 29. p.
68.]

All this strange solemn festival guise pope Urbanus the Fourth learned, not of Christ, or Paul, but only by the revelation of dame Eve the anchoress : and by her good advice founded the new feast of *Corpus Christi*, and caused the sacrament to be borne about in procession.

Chrysost. in
Matt. hom.
51. [vil. 518.]

But the ancient and worthy father Chrysostom saith : *Discamus Christum ex ipsius voluntate honorare : nam qui honoratur, eo maxime honore letatur, quem ipse vult : non quem nos optamus* : “Let us learn to honour Christ *after his own will* : for he that is honoured, delighteth most in that honour *that he himself would have* : not in that honour that we can fancy.” Notwithstanding, when the sacramental bread is carried only upon a horse, and the pope himself is borne aloft in a chair of gold, upon the shoulders of six or eight noblemen, I pray you, whether of them hath greater honour ?

For the rest, “The pope,” saith M. Harding, “is an old

¹⁴ [These Questions ex Vet. Test. are not genuine.]

man: he rideth in his *pontificalibus*: he is loden with apparel: the pyx is weighty: the weather is hot: there is none other creature to supply his room." Therefore it is lately concluded in Louvain in great solemn sadness, that a horse must be had in to play the pope's part, and to carry the monstrance.

Here, forasmuch as M. Harding hath purposely made mention of *the pope's riding in his pontificalibus*, and the solemnity and pomp thereof is known to few, it shall not be impertinent, briefly to disclose the order thereof. Thus therefore it is written in the Ceremoniary of Rome: *Sic papa equitat in pontificalibus in aliquam civitatem. Cardinales descendunt ex equis, et accedunt reverenter ad papam, et osculantur illi pedem.....Episcopus civitatis accedit ad papam cum debitis reverentiis, et offert illi crucem osculandam: quam pontifex reverenter, cum mitra tamen, osculabitur. Non enim commode poterit ei abstrahi equiti ab equestribus. Si tamen placuerit ei mitram deponere, non erit inconveniens. Deinde prælatus incipiat antiphonam, Ecce sacerdos magnus: "Thus the pope's holiness rideth into any city in his *pontificalibus*. The cardinals light from their horses, and come reverently unto the pope, and kiss his foot. The bishop of the city cometh likewise to the pope with due reverence, and offereth him the *cross* to kiss: which the pope shall kiss reverently, *keeping on his mitre notwithstanding*. For while he sitteth on horseback, his horsemen cannot very easily take off his mitre, and set it on again. Howbeit, if it shall like him to put off his mitre, it shall be no great inconvenience. Afterward the bishop shall begin this anthem, 'Behold the great priest.'"*

And so he pricketh forth along in his *pontificalibus*.

The carrying out of the *ark of God* into the field, in the time of Eli the high priest, bodeth no very good argument for the carrying of the sacrament. For at that time the army of Israel was overthrown, thirty thousand soldiers were slain, and amongst them the two sons of Eli: the *ark* was taken: Eli himself fell back from his chair, and brake his neck. Therefore, M. Harding, ye shall have much ado to make good your procession by this example.

"This matter," ye say, "hath been proved by sundry

Ceremon.
sect. 12, cap.
5. [fol. 123.]

1 Sam. iv. 5.

miracles." First, whether there have been any such miracles wrought or no, it is uncertain. But were it granted, yet may not your miracles always stand for good proofs. Your own doctor Alexander de Hales saith : *Miracula fiunt aliquando humana procuratione : aliquando diabolica operatione* : " Miracles be wrought sometime by the working and procurement of men : and sometime by the conveyance of the devil."

Alexand. Hal-
len. pt. 4.
quest. 53.
mem. 4. art. 3.

[Supra vol. i.
246.]
Artic. i.

The tales that ye allege of Tharsitius and Satyrus make nothing, either for the adoration of the sacrament, or else for the pope's palfrey. Women, and children, and laymen used then to carry home the sacrament in their napkins, and to keep it in forcelets, as in my former Reply it is largely shewed. But these were abuses of the mystery : and therefore afterward were abolished.

Acts xix. 28.

It grieveth you much, that we say, *The pope causeth the sacramental bread to be carried before him upon a horse, as the kings of Persia used in old times to carry the fire, which they called Orimasda, and imagined the same to be their god.* And therefore ye cry out in your passion, " Chams-brood, hell-hounds," and whatsoever might serve you best : even with like sobriety and modesty, as they who sometime in the like case cried out, *Magna Diana Ephesiorum* : " Great is Diana of the Ephesians." Howbeit, other example more agreeable to resemble your folly we could find none.

De Con. dist.
1. Non oportet.
In Gloss.

Neither may you justly and truly say, ye have received none of your orders and usages from the heathens. Your own Gloss noteth upon the Decrees : *Clerici euntes ad tumulos mortuorum, portabant secum sacramenta corporis et sanguinis Christi : et super tumulos ea distribuebant. Et hæc consuetudo facta fuit a gentibus* : " The clerks" (or priests) " going to the graves of the dead, carried with them the sacraments of the body and blood of Christ : and made distribution thereof over the graves. And this same custom was used among the heathens." Nicolaus Leonicensus

Nicol. Leoni-
cenus, in
Varia Hist.
lib. 2. cap. 21.

saith : *Isidis sacerdotes in Ægypto utebantur lineis vestibus, et semper erant detonso capillo : quod etiam per manus traditum ad nostra usque tempora pervenisse videtur. Siquidem ii qui apud nos Divino cultui, et sacris altaribus præsidet, barbam comamve nutrire prohibentur : et in sacris*

utuntur lineis amictibus : “The priests of the goddess Isis in Egypt used to wear *linen surplices*, and evermore had their *head shaven* : which thing seemeth to have been derived from them, unto our time, from hand to hand. For they that among us minister God’s service, and serve the holy altars, are forbidden to suffer the hair of their head, or their beard, to grow : and in their divine service they use linen garments.” Epiphanius saith, that the heretics called *Collyridiani* used to set forth, and to carry about bread (no doubt but the *sacrament*) in the honour of the blessed Virgin Mary. Nazianzenus seemeth thus to complain of some such unseemly behaviours in his time. *Quid referam*, saith he, τὰ μυστήρια κωμωδοῦμενα ? “What shall I speak of the holy mysteries turned now *into a play*, or a *comedy* ?” For so Claudius du Saintes, your own doctor, expoundeth these words : *Mysteria in comœdias conversa*.

Of the like disorder of the heathens Apuleius seemeth to say, *Dicimus, deos incedere humanis pedibus* : “We tell you, that our gods go on men’s feet¹⁴.” The whole difference between you and them in this behalf standeth only in this, that your god goeth on horse’ feet, and theirs on man’s feet.

But the holy sacrament of Christ’s death was never appointed unto us to this end, to be carried thus about in open show, but only to be received as Christ himself commanded, in remembrance of his body and blood. And therefore St. Cyprian saith : *Recipitur, non includitur* : “*It is received : it is not shut up*.”

That ye allege as out of St. Augustine, “That the Pagnims found fault with the Christian people, for honour done to the body and blood of Christ, under your forms of bread and wine,” it is an open and a manifest untruth. For St. Augustine in that place speaketh not one word, neither of the *body*¹⁵ and *blood* of Christ, nor of your *forms* and *accidents* : nor of any manner *adoration*, or honour

¹⁴ [Apul. Met. leg. lib. 11. “Dei, dignati pedibus humanis incedere.”]

¹⁵ [It is to be observed, that in the context (a few lines before), the Louvain edition had the words

Epiphani. lib. 3. hieres. 79. De Collyridianis, [tom. i. 1058.] Ἀπτον προτιθέασιν καὶ ἀναφέρουσιν εἰς ὄνομα [τῆς] Μαρίας. Nazianzen. ad Heron. [i. 464.] Claud. du Saintes, de Liturgiis, in Prefat. [cap. 1.]

Apuleius, lib. 1. [leg. lib. 11. i. 775.]

Cyprian. [Arnold.] de Cœna Domini. [app. cxv.]

Augustin. contra Faustum, lib. 20. cap. 13. [viii. 342.]

done unto the sacrament. It shall behove you to write hereafter more advisedly: otherwise the learned will say, ye either know not, or care not, what ye write. This objection of St. Augustine is answered more at large in my former Reply.

Art. 8. divis.
24. [Supra
vol. iii. p.
52.]

Augustin. de
Civitate Dei,
lib. i. cap. 29.
[vii. 27.]

Touching the matter itself, St. Augustine saith: *Deus meus ubique præsens est, ubique totus, nusquam inclusus: qui possit adesse secretus, abesse non motus*: "My God is every where present, every where whole, *shut up or enclosed nowhere*: able secretly to be present, and to be absent without moving." And St. Chrysostom saith:

Chrysost. de
Jejuniis, et
Lectione
Geneseos.
[ed. 1588.
tom. i. p. 440.
ed. Bened. iv.
p. 645.]

Magnum, crede mihi, bonum est, scire quid sit creatura, et quid sit Creator: et quæ sint opera, quis vero opifex. Si enim hoc diligenter scirent discernere hæretici, nunquam utique omnia confunderent, et quæ sursum sunt, facerent deorsum. Non dico, quod cælum et stellas deorsum, terram autem sursum ducerent: sed quod Regem ab excelsis sedibus deducentes, cum creaturis et operibus collocaverint: creaturam vero divinis honoribus affecerint: "Believe me, it is a great matter to understand, what is the *creature*, and what is *God the Creator*: what are the *works*, and what is the *workman*. For if these heretics could make *diligent difference hereof*, they would not thus make confusion of all things, nor place those things *beneath* that *be above*. I mean not, they either pull down the heaven, or the stars, or set up the earth" (in their place): "but that they pull down the *King himself from his high throne, and place him amongst his works and creatures: and of the other side, worship a creature with godly honour.*"

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 15. Divis. 2.

Besides, where they say, and sometime do per-

[Vol. iv. p.
25.]

"corpus Christi," which, however, are absent in all MSS.
"Noster autem panis et calix, non

"quilibet... sed certa consecratione mysticus fit nobis (corpus Christi), non nascitur."]

parties think nothing of the matter, and understand full little what is done, this is a mockery, a heathenish fancy, and a very toy. For it is our faith, that applieth the death and cross of Christ to our benefit, and not the act of the massing priest. "Faith had in the sacraments," saith Augustine, "doth justify, and not the sacraments." And Origen saith: "Christ is the Priest, the propitiation, and sacrifice: which propitiation cometh to every one by mean of faith¹⁶." And so, by this reckoning, we say, that the sacraments of Christ, without faith, do not once profit these that be alive: a great deal less do they profit those that be dead.

Origen. ad
Rom. lib. 3.
cap. 3. [iv.
515.]

M. HARDING.

^a Lest any piece of your Apology should be without a witness, ^a Untruth, for proof that ye are his children who is the father of lies, ye enclosed. For make us to affirm, that by our masses we distribute and apply to this is your men indifferently, howsoever they be disposed, for so ye mean, shall appear. as it appeareth partly by that ye say here, and specially by your doctrine otherwheres uttered, all the merits of Christ's death. But tell us, ^b who ever taught this doctrine in the catholic church?.....

Yea, God is so good and prone to bestow his mercy, that, not only when a man is through faith prepared for it, he giveth it abundantly unto him: but also though he, of his own part, have no faith presently, yet for others' sake, which are God's dearly beloved friends, he fareth the better, and hath that gift obtained to him. ^c As when St. Stephen prayed at his death for those that persecuted him, for whom prayed he then, but for those who had no faith at all in Christ? and when this grace was given unto them, as that from their Jewishness they came to the faith of Christ, who shall exclude that blessed martyr from this worship and honour, that through his prayer, as by one special mean, that grace was applied unto them?

^b Your own
scholastical
catholic
doctors,
M. Harding:
read the
answer.

^c A proper
shift. We
speak of
sacraments.
M. Harding
answereth us
of prayer.

What effect his prayer took, if any man thereof doubt, he may think it to have wrought much for the benefit of others of less malice, seeing that it did so much in Paul; "who," as the scripture saith, "yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter

¹⁶ [Origen. "Invenies. . . esse
"ipsum et propitiatorium, et ponti-
"ficem, et hostiam quæ offertur
"pro populo . . . quæ tamen propi-
"tatio ad unumquemque fidelium
"per viam fidei venit."]

against Christ's disciples, was so changed and converted, that of a persecutor he became an apostle." For as St. Augustine writeth, *Si Sanctus Stephanus sic non orasset, ecclesia Paulum non haberet*: "If St. Stephen had not prayed so, the church should not have had Paul." Now if those that be no priests without public authority of consecrating the body and blood of Christ, yet by way of prayer do obtain, that men be converted to the faith, which is the applying of one fruit of Christ's merits, much more the public minister and bishop, which assumed from among men is ordained for men in matters belonging to God, that he may offer up gifts and sacrifices for sins.....

Serm. 1. de Sanctis. [v. app. 358.]
Contra duas epist. Pelagian. ad Bonifacium, lib. 1. cap. 19. [x. 427.]

Heb. v. 1.

d Untruth, blasphemous and horrible.

e Untruth. For Christ never bade you to offer him up unto his Father.

And now, if ye list to learn what kind of applying we use in our masses, we do offer up unto God first ^d his Son, representing his passion, and celebrating the memory of the same ^e according to Christ's institution¹⁷.....

What kind of applying is in the sacrifice of the mass.

But what measure of good we procure them, to God only is that known. "If," as the learned bishop Prosper saith, "the grace of our Saviour pass over some persons," (as we see it to happen,) "and if the prayer of the church" (wherein the sacrifice is contained, after St. Augustine's mind) "be not admitted for them: it is to be referred to the secret judgments of God's justice, and it is to be acknowledged, that the depth of this secret may not be opened in this life¹⁸.".....

Lib. 1. de Vocat. Gentium, cap. 4.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Thus ye say, M. Harding: "Ye make us to affirm, that by our masses we distribute, and apply to men indifferently the merits of Christ's death: howsoever they be disposed, in token, that ye are the children of him, who is the father of lies." Therefore ye say: "Tell us, who ever taught this doctrine in the catholic church?"

If you be so unskilful, M. Harding, and so far to seek in your own doctors, then it may please you to understand, that the most catholic pillars of your catholic church have even thus taught us. Thomas de Vio, otherwise called Cajetan, a catholic cardinal of your catholic church of Rome, in the conference he had at Augusta in Germany, with doctor Luther, said thus: *Fides non est necessaria accessuro ad eucharistiam*: "Faith is not necessary for

Paralip. Ursp. anno 1518.

¹⁷ [Harding adds, "then through him we offer up also ourselves, and all men that be of his church, &c. If we pray more specially for any than for others, our prayer, and

that most holy sacrifice helpeth them so much the more," &c.]

¹⁸ ["And yet bolder may we be to pray for the dead," &c.]

him, that will receive the sacrament of thanksgiving." Notwithstanding otherwheres he acknowledgeth, this was an error: and confesseth, it was commonly received and believed of many, even in your catholic church of Rome.

Thus he writeth: *In hoc videtur communis multorum error, quod putant, hoc sacrificium ex solo opere operato habere certum meritum, vel certam satisfactionem, quæ applicatur* Cardinal Cajetan, de Usu Spiritualium, quæst. 3.

huic, vel illi: "Hercin standeth the common error of many, that they think, this sacrifice hath a certain merit or satisfaction, which is applied to this man or to that man," (not by mean of the faith of the receiver, but) "by the only mean of the work that is wrought" (by the priest)¹⁹.

Gabriel Biel saith: "The priest receiveth the sacrament: and the virtue thereof passeth into all the members of the church." Biel. lect. 18. [leg. 8r. lit. H. fol. cccxxix.]

Jacobus de Valentia saith: "*The priest is the mouth of the body.* Therefore when the priest receiveth the sacrament, *all the members are refreshed*"²⁰. Jacob. de Valentia, serm. 2. de Epiphania.

Again he saith: *Nos communicamus ore sacerdotis*: "We, that be of the people, do communicate or receive the sacrament, *by the mouth of the priest.*" Thomas of Aquine, your angelical doctor, saith thus: *Sicut corpus Domini semel oblatum est in cruce pro debito originali, ita offertur jugiter pro* [suppl. *nostris*] *quotidianis delictis in altari*: "As the body of our Lord was once offered upon the cross for debt of original sin, so it is daily offered upon the altar for the debt of daily sins."


Addition.

Addition. M. Harding. "You have corrupt St. Thomas' words with false translation, Englishing *pro quotidianis delictis*, for the debt of daily sin, where debt is not in the Latin." *The answer.* What meaneth this childishness, M. Harding? was this the greatest corruption ye could espy? can you imagine any sin to be without debt? I beseech you: wherefore saith Almighty God, "Your sins have made division between you and me?" wherefore doth the wasteful son cry out, "O father, I have offended" M. Harding, fol. 356. Isa. lix. 2. Luke xv. 18.

¹⁹ [There is some mistake here, as there is only one quæst. in Cajetan's tract, "De Usu Spiritu-
"alium," and that does not con-

tain the passage.]

²⁰ [The Editor has not had access to any sermon by Jacobus Pareus de Valentia.]

against heaven, and against thee?" wherefore saith St. Paul, Rom. vi. 23. "Death is the reward of sin?" wherefore hath Christ Matt. vi. 12. taught us to say, *Dimitte nobis debita nostra*: "O Lord, forgive us our debts?" but only in respect of *debt*, that is due to sin? Regard better, what ye write. Why should such follies come from Louvain? 

This doctrine not long sithence was holden for catholic, and was strongly maintained by your catholic doctors. Catharinus, one of the worthies of your late chapter of Trident, saith: *Apparet, quod pro peccatis sub novo testamento, post acceptam salutaris hostie in baptismo efficaciam commissis, non habemus pro peccato hostiam illam, quam Christus obtulit pro peccato mundi, et pro delictis baptismum præcedentibus: non enim nisi semel ille mortuus est: et ideo semel duntaxat hostia illa ad hunc effectum applicatur*: "It appeareth, that for the sins committed under the new testament, after that we have received in baptism the power of the healthful sacrifice, *we have no more that sacrifice for sin, which Christ once offered for the sin of the world*, and for sins committed before baptism. For Christ never died but once. And therefore that sacrifice of Christ crucified *is applied unto us once only* to this effect²¹."

Catharinus,
de Incruento
Sacrificio
Novi et Æ-
terni Testa-
menti.

Hereby, M. Harding, ye may see, that this doctrine lacketh no defence amongst your catholics. The sum and meaning hereof is this, That our sins committed after baptism are not forgiven by the death of Christ, but only by the sacrifice of the mass. Which thing, what it seemeth to you, I cannot tell: but unto all godly ears it seemeth an horrible great blasphemy.

Here, to speak of prayers, specially in so large a sort, it was far impertinent to your purpose, as being utterly no part of this question.

The merits of Christ's death, whereof we entreat, are conveyed unto us by God, and received by us. God conveyeth them to us *only of his mercy*, and we receive them *only by faith*. But the ways, whereby either to procure God's mercy, or to enkindle our faith, are many and

²¹ [Catharinus de Incruento Sacrificio. The Editor has not found any treatise by Catharinus under this title.]

sundry. God's mercy is procured sometime by prayer, sometime by other means. But to breed, or increase faith in us, there are no ways, than can be reckoned. Some men are moved only by the hearing of God's word: some others by the beholding and weighing of God's miracles. Justinus the martyr was first allured to the faith by the cruelty of the tyrants, and by the constancy and patience of God's saints. St. Cyprian saith: *Tanta est vis martyrii, ut per illam credere etiam cogatur, qui te vult occidere*: "So great is the power of martyrdom, that thereby even he is forced to believe, that would kill thee." St. Augustine saith, He was stirred up to come to Christ, by reading a heathen book written by Cicero, called *Hortensius*. Thus he saith: *Ille liber mutavit affectum meum, et ad te ipsum, Domine, mutavit preces meas*: "That" (heathen) "book changed my mind, and turned my prayer, O Lord, unto thee."

Euseb. lib. 4.
cap. 8. [1.
152.]

Cyprian. de
laude Mar-
tyrii. [p. 348.]

Augustin.
Confess. lib.
3. cap. 4. [1.
90.]

Among other causes, the sacraments serve specially to direct and to aid our faith: for they are, as St. Augustine calleth them, *verba visibilia*, "*visible words*:" and seals and testimonies of the gospel.

Augustin.
contra Fau-
stum, lib. 19.
cap. 16. [viii.
321.]

All this notwithstanding, we say, It is neither the work of the priest, nor the nature of the sacrament, as of itself, that maketh us partakers of Christ's death, but only the faith of the receiver. St. Augustine saith: *Unde est ista tanta virtus aque, ut corpus tangat, et cor obluat, nisi faciente verbo? Non quia dicitur, sed quia creditur*: "From whence hath the water this great power, that it toucheth the body, and washeth the heart, saving by the *working of the word*? Not for that it is pronounced, but for that it is believed."

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
80. [iii. pt. 2.
703.]

So saith Hesychius: *Gratia Dei comprehenditur sola fide*.....: "The grace of God" (of our part) "*is received by only faith*." So saith Cyrillus: *Siclus fidei nostræ formam habet. Si enim fidem obtuleris, tanquam pretium, (a) Christo, velut ariete immaculato in hostiam dato, accipies remissionem peccatorum*: "The shekel hath the form of our faith. For if thou offer up thy faith, as the price, thou

Hesych. in
Levit. lib. 4.
cap. 14. [fol.
81 b.]
Cyrill. [leg.
Origen.] in
Levit. lib. 3.
[Orig. Opp.
ii. 198.]

shalt receive remission of thy sins from Christ, that unspotted Ram, that was given for a sacrifice²²."

Where ye say, "Ye offer up Christ, the Son of God, really and substantially unto God the Father," if ye speak in your dream, it is a very pleasant phantasy: but if ye be awake, and know what ye say, then is it a great blasphemy: as in my former Reply it may appear more at large.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 16. Divis. 1.

And as for their brags they are wont to make of their *purgatory*, though we know, it is not a thing so very late risen amongst them [original, *non ita norum*], yet is it no better than a blockish, and an old wives' device.

M. HARDING.

Purgatory seemeth not to us a thing that we should much brag of, no more than ye will brag of hell. We tremble at the remembrance of it, rather than brag of it.....Well, howsoever it be, will ye, nill ye, (we see) ^a ye be driven to confess the same to be no new thing²³.....

^a No marvel. It was received of the paynims long ere the apostles were born.

^b Untruth. Read the answer.

^c This phantasy were somewhat, if we had no purgation in Christ's blood.

^d A doughty argument to prove purgatory.

Indeed if you call them papists, among whom the doctrine of praying for the dead, ^b whereof necessarily followeth the doctrine of purgatory, is delivered, taught, and holden: then are the apostles, who delivered it by tradition, (as Chrysostom and Damascene report,) papists.....First, ^c forasmuch as nothing that is defiled cometh into the kingdom of heaven, and some depart out of this life, though in the faith of Christ, and children of the everlasting kingdom, yet not thoroughly and perfectly clean: it remaineth, that such after this life, before they come to the place of everlasting joy, have their purgation.....Furthermore the apostle saith, "Seeing then we have these promises, dearly be-
loved, let ^d us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, making perfect our satisfaction in the fear of God." Who seeth not hereof to follow, that to many, which be justified, somewhat of satisfaction and holiness lacketh? which if they be taken from hence, before they attain to the measure of holiness requisite, be they not then after this life in state to be purged and cleansed?.....

Purgatory acknowledged by the defenders to be of antiquity.

Rev. xxi. 27.

2 Cor. vii. 1.

²² [This commentary on Levit. though sometimes attributed to St. Cyrill, is in fact Origen's. Supra vol. iii. 67, note ⁵².]

²³ ["for so is your Latin, though it hath liked your gentle lady of her good will to wrest it unto us," &c.]

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here are we come to the *paper walls* and *painted fires* of purgatory. For so it liked M. Harding, not long sithence, pleasantly to sport at it in the pulpits, as a bug meet only to fray children. Yet now, upon better advice, and deeper study, *he trembleth*, God wot, *and quaketh for fear*, to remember the torments, that somebody hath sithence told him to be there. Howbeit, let him not so much dismay himself. The pope, as he either first made it, or received it by hand from the heathens, and first allowed it, even so hath he the whole jurisdiction and power over it, and commandeth in and out at his pleasure.

Whether ye make brags hereof, or no, I leave it in question. Certainly for this, and other like causes, one of your fellows saith: *Excepto peccato, papa potest quasi omnia facere, quæ Deus potest*: “*Sin* excepted, the pope can do in a manner all things, that God can do.” Another saith: *Animæ existentes in purgatorio, sunt de jurisdictione papæ: et papa, si vellet, posset totum purgatorium evacuare*: “The souls being in purgatory, are” (in the pope’s peculiar, and) “under the pope’s jurisdiction: and the pope, if it might stand with his pleasure, were able” (to make gaol delivery, and) “to avoid all purgatory”²⁴. And to this purpose, the pope himself commandeth, and chargeth the angels of God²⁵, to fetch forth from thence, whomsoever and how many soever he will have delivered, as hereafter in a place more convenient it shall better appear. If these seem to be no *brags*, then let them hardly be called by some other name, that may seem to please you better.

Ye take good hold in that we confess, *this imagination of purgatory is no new fancy*. Howbeit, your advantage

²⁴ [Fabricius Med. et Infim. Latin. lib. ix. p. 43, notices a writer named Johannes Angelus, A.D. 1409, as the author of a work on purgatory, extant in MS. The Editor is unable to learn whether it was ever printed.]

²⁵ [Clemens VI. This monstrous Bull (dated from Avignon) had been suppressed by the Roman

authorities; but it was again published by Hoornebeck, from a MS. found at Utrecht. The Bull (of indulgence) runs thus: “Et nihilominus prorsus mandamus angelis paradysi, quantum animam illius a purgatorio penitus ab-solutam in paradysi gloriam in-troducant.”]

Panormitan. de Electione, cap. Licet. [tom. i. fol. 123. col. 4 f.]

Johan. Angelus.

Clemens VI. In Bulla. [p. 273.]

herein is not so great. There have been errors, and great errors, from the beginning. St. Augustine saith : *Origenes ipsum diabolum, atque angelos ejus post graviora pro meritis, et diuturniora supplicia, ex illis cruciatibus eruendos, atque sociandos sanctis angelis credidit* : “The ancient learned father Origen believed, that the devil himself and his angels, after great and long punishment suffered for their wickedness, shall be delivered from their torments, and shall be placed” (in heaven) “with the holy angels of God.” Origen himself saith : “There were some, that thought, that Christ should go down into hell, and there be *crucified again*, to save them, that by his preaching, and former death could not be saved.” Again the same Origen saith of himself : *Ego puto, quod, post resurrectionem ex mortuis, indigebimus sacramento eluente nos, atque purgante* : “I think, that, *after we shall rise again* from the dead, *we shall have need of the sacrament*” (of baptism²⁶) “to wash us, and to purge us clean.”

Augustin de Civitate Dei, lib. 21. cap. 17. [vii. 637.]

Origen, in Epist. ad Rom. cap. 6. lib. 5. [iv. 568.]

Origen, in Locum, hom. 14. [iii. 948.]

Augustin. de Civitate Dei, lib. 21. cap. 13. [vii. 633.]

St. Augustine saith : *Quidam nullus penas, nisi purgatorias, volunt esse post mortem* : “Some men will have no punishment to be after death, but *only the pains of purgatory*.”

1 Cor. xv. 29.

Even in Paul’s time there were some, that, being alive, *were baptized for the dead*. And by the council of Carthage it appeareth, there were some, that used to thrust the *sacrament into the mouth of the dead body*, meaning thereby, as it may be thought, to procure some relief for the soul. The words be these : *Placuit, ut corporibus defunctorum eucharistia non detur. Dictum est enim a Domino, Accipite, et edite. Cadavera autem nec accipere possunt, nec edere* : “We think it good, that the sacrament be not given to the bodies of the *dead*. For our Lord saith, ‘Take and eat.’ But dead bodies can neither take nor eat.” These were ancient errors in old times, as it is easy to be seen.

Concil. Carthag. 3. can. 6. [iii. 881.]

As for the phantasy of *purgatory*, it sprang first from the heathens, and was received amongst them in that time of darkness, long before the coming of Christ, as it may

²⁶ [The Editor sees nothing in the introduction of the word this passage of Origen to justify “baptism.”]

plainly appear by Plato and Virgil, in whom ye shall find described at large, the whole commonweal, and all the orders and degrees of *purgatory*. St. Augustine saith, The old heathen Romans had a sacrifice, which they called *sacrum purgatorium*, “a *purgatory sacrifice*.”

Plato in
Timæo.
Æneid. 6.

Augustin. de
Civitate, lib.
7. cap. 7.
[vii. 168.]

You say: “If they be papists, that defend *purgatory*, then must Christ’s apostles needs be papists. *For they have taught us purgatory*, (not by any thing that ever they wrote, but) *by tradition*.” This is as true, as that St. Peter said mass in Rome with a *golden cope*, and a *triple crown*. Unless perhaps some man will think, whereas St. Paul saith: *Homines privati veritate, existimantes quæstum esse pietatem*: “They be men void of truth, thinking that their gain is godliness:” or, whereas St. Peter saith: *Per avaritiam fictis sermonibus negotiabuntur de vobis*: “Through covetousness by feigned talk they shall make sale of you:” that by these words they gave us warning of the very form and doctrine of your *purgatory*. For better authorities, than these be, I reckon, ye can lightly find none.

As for *prayer for the dead*, “which” (ye say) “ye have received by tradition from the apostles,” notwithstanding it were granted to be true, yet doth it not evermore import *purgatory*. For Chrysostom and Basil in their *Liturgies*, make their public and solemn prayer in this sort: *Offerimus tibi rationalem hunc cultum, pro in fide requiescentibus, majoribus, patribus, patriarchis, prophetis, et apostolis, præconibus et evangelistis, martyribus, confessoribus, &c. Præcipue vero pro sanctissima, immaculata, super omnes benedicta, Domina nostra deipara, et semper Virgine Maria*: “We offer, O Lord, unto thee this reasonable service for them that rest in faith, *our elders, our fathers, the patriarchs, the prophets, the apostles, the preachers, the evangelists, the martyrs, the confessors, &c.* Specially for the most holy, without spot, blessed above all, our lady, God’s mother, and ever *Virgin Mary*.” St.

Basil. [ed.
Lat. p. 44: ed.
Gr. p. 59:]
et Chrysost.
[ed. Lat. p.
69: ed. Gr. p.
98:] in Litur-
giis.

²⁷ [In S. Chrysostom’s *Liturgy*, (ed. Du Sainctes, generally used by bishop Jewel,) the words are as he reports them. In that of St. Basil the form is different:

... ἵνα εὐρωμεν ἕλεον καὶ χάριν
μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἀπ’
αἰῶνός σου εὐαρεστησάντων, προ-
πατόρων, κ. τ. λ.]

Cyprian. lib.
3. epist. 6.
[p. 50.]

Cyprian saith in like manner: *Sacrificamus pro martyribus*: "We make sacrifice for the martyrs²⁸." Yet, I trow, ye will not conclude hereof, that the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, preachers, evangelists, martyrs, confessors, and the blessed Virgin Mary, were all in *purgatory*. Otherwise ye would much enlarge the pope's dominion.

Of the other side, in your *masses* for the dead, ye have used to pray thus: *Libera eos a tartaro: e profundo lacu: ex ore leonis*: "Deliver them, O Lord," (not from *purgatory*, but) "from *hell*: from that *deep dungeon*: from the *lion's mouth*." I trow, ye are not so much thrall unto the pope, that for his sake ye will turn the *lion's mouth*, the *deep dungeon*, and all the world, and *hell itself*, into *purgatory*.

Thus ye see, M. Harding, by your own doctrine, ye may pray for the dead, and yet be never the near of your *purgatory*.

But to help forward the matter, at the least by some natural reason, ye say thus: "Forasmuch as nothing that is defiled cometh into the kingdom of heaven, and some depart out of this life, though in the faith of Christ, and children of the everlasting kingdom, yet not thoroughly and perfectly clean, it remaineth, that such, after this life, before they come to the place of everlasting joy, have their *purgation*." To warrant your *minor* in this argument, ye bring in the words of St. Paul as rightly, and as well to purpose, as your manner otherwise is commonly to handle the scriptures: "Though our outward man be corrupted and weakened" (which words St. Ambrose expoundeth thus: "*by oppression, by stripes, by hunger, by thirst, by cold, by nakedness*") "yet our soul is renewed, and made stronger day by day." And again: "Let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of flesh and spirit:" "*ergo*," (say ye) "we must confess by force of these words, that there must needs be a place, wherein to purge us clean after this life." Here may we a little put you in remembrance by the way: If we cleanse ourselves, according to these

²⁸ [S. Cyp. "...celebrentur" "ficia ob commemorationem eo-
"hic a nobis oblationes et sacri- "rum...."]

words of St. Paul, from all manner filthiness, both of flesh and of spirit, I beseech you, what remaineth there then further, to be purged in purgatory?

Howbeit, to prove the imperfection and corruption of nature, that evermore hangeth in our flesh, ye might, in my judgment, have alleged many other authorities, far more pregnant and clearer than these. Esay saith: "All our righteousness is liked unto a foul stained clout." Job saith: *Inter sanctos ejus nemo est fidelis: et cæli non sunt mundi in conspectu ejus*: "Among the saints of God there is none faithful: the heavens are not clean in his sight." St. Paul saith: "I know there is no good thing in my flesh." St. Augustine saith: "Let the apostles of Christ themselves say, O Lord, forgive us our offences."

Isa. lxiv. 6.

Job xv. 15.

Rom. vii. 18.

Augustin. in Psalm cxliii. [ad. Psalm cxlii. iv. 1593.]

Such imperfections and corruptions, while we live, we evermore carry in our flesh. Therefore, say you, "to be purged hereof, that we may be clean, and fit to enter into heaven, we must needs pass through the fires of purgatory." By this mean ye have well enlarged the pope's jurisdiction. For this being true, neither is there, nor never was there any creature, neither prophet, nor apostle, nor martyr, nor angel, nor archangel, nor heaven itself, Christ only excepted, but of force must needs be cleansed in your purgatory. And therefore Origen, a great fautor of this error, saith thus: *Ut ego arbitror, omnes nos necesse est venire in illum ignem: etiamsi Paulus aliquis sit, vel Petrus*: "As I suppose, all we must needs come into that fire: yea although it be Paul, or Peter." And therefore he saith, as it is alleged before: *Ego puto, quod, et post resurrectionem ex mortuis, indigebimus sacramento eluente nos, atque purgante. Nemo enim absque sordibus resurgere poterit. Neque ullam puto posse animam reperiri, quæ universis statim vitiis careat*: "I think, that, after the resurrection from the dead, we shall need the sacrament" (of baptism)²⁹ "to wash us, and to make us clean. For no man can rise again without filth. Neither do I think there can any soul be found, void from all manner of sin."

Origen. in Psalm. xxxvi. hom. 3. [ii. 664.]

Origen. in Lucam, hom. 14. [iii. 948.]

²⁹ [Supra, vol. v. p. 200, note ²⁶.]

But all these be vain phantasies: I mean, as well these of M. Harding, as also the other of Origen. St. John saith: *Sanguis Jesu Christi Filii Dei purgat nos ab omni peccato*: 1 John i. 7. “The blood of Jesus Christ the Son of God purgeth us, and maketh us clean from all our sins.” The prophet saith: “In what hour soever a sinner shall repent and mourn for his sins, he shall be safe.” Isa. i. 18. Esay saith: “If your sins shall be as red as scarlet, yet shall they be made as white as snow.” Heb. i. 3. St. Paul saith: *Christus purgationem peccatorum nostrorum fecit*: “Christ” (by his blood) “hath wrought the purgation of our sins.” Therefore St. Cyprian saith: *Sanguis tuus, Domine, non querit ultionem: sanguis tuus lavat crimina, peccata condonat*: Cyprian. [Arnold.] de Passione Christi. [ap. p. cxxxl.] “Thy blood, O Lord, seeketh no revenge: thy blood washeth our sins, and pardoneth our trespasses.”

And, whereas you tell us, out of some heathenish phantasy, that “sins cannot be washed away, but with long tract of time, and pain in purgatory,” St. Cyprian saith: *In eodem articulo temporis, cum jam anima festinet ad exitum, et egrediens ad labia expirantis emerserit, penitentiam clementissimi Dei benignitas non aspernatur. Nec serum est, quod verum est*: Cyprian. [Arnold.] de Carina Domini. [app. cxvii.] “In that very moment of time, even when the soul is ready to pass, and is even at the lips of the party ready to yield up the spirit, the goodness of our most merciful God refuseth not repentance. And whatsoever is truly done, is never too late.”

St. Chrysostom saith: *Latro in cruce neque uno die opus habebat. Et quid dico, uno die? Neque brevi hora. Tanta est Dei erga nos misericordia*: Chrysostom. in Genes. hom. 27. [iv. 264.] “The thief on the cross needed not so much as one day, to repent himself. What speak I of one day? No, he needed not one hour. So great is the mercy of God towards us.”

Of the other side, if any man depart hence without repentance, St. Augustine saith: *Imparatum inveniet illum dies Domini, quem imparatum invenerit sue vitæ hujus ultimus dies*: Augustin. epist. 80. [ii. 743.] “Him shall the day of the Lord find unprovided, whom the last day of this life findeth unprovided.”

St. Ambrose saith: *Qui hic non accipit* [leg. *acceperit*] *remissionem peccatorum, ibi* [leg. *illic*] *non erit*: Ambros. de Bono Mortis. [cap. 2. i. 391.] “He that

here in this life receiveth not remission of his sins, *shall not be there.*" And St. Hierom, expounding these words of Christ, "Thou shalt not go forth thence, until thou hast paid the last farthing," saith thus: *Significat semper non exiturum esse: quia semper solvat novissimum quadrantem, dum sempiternas pœnas terrenorum peccatorum luit:* Hieron. in Lamentationes Hieremie, lib. i. cap. i. [v. 807.] "Christ's meaning is, that he shall *never come out:* for that he must *evermore pay the last farthing,* whiles he suffereth *everlasting punishment* for his sins committed in this world."

So saith St. Augustine: *Donec solvas novissimum quadrantem: miror, si non eam significat pœnam, quæ vocatur æterna:* "Until thou pay the last farthing: I marvel, but he meaneth that pain, *which is called everlasting.*" Augustin. de Serm. Dom. in Monte, lib. i. [cap. i. iii. pt. 2. 177.]

Hereby, M. Harding, I think it may partly appear, that you maintain *your painted fire and paper walls,* with *painted authorities* and *paper reasons.* Verily the Christian people of the *east church of God,* which sometime was as great and as famous as the church of the west, notwithstanding they believed in God and his Christ, and knew there was both hell and heaven, yet in *your purgatory they had no skill.* One of your doctors saith: *Usque in hodiernum diem purgatorium non est a Græcis creditum:* "Until this day, of the Grecians, or of the east church, purgatory was never believed." Therefore ye cannot justly say, that your phantasy herein was evermore accounted universal or catholic. Alphonsus de Heresibus, lib. 8. de Indulgentiis. [p. 578.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 16. *Divis. 2.*

Augustine indeed sometime saith, there is such a certain place: sometime he denieth not, but there may be such a one: sometime he doubteth: sometime again he utterly denieth, there is any at all, and thinketh, that men are therein deceived by a certain natural good will, they bear their friends departed. But yet of this one error hath there grown up such a harvest of those *massmongers,* that, the *masses* being sold abroad commonly in every corner, the temples of Augustin. in Psal. lxxxv. [iv. 912.]
Augustin. lib. Hypognosticon. [5. tom. x. app. 40.]
In Enchiridion, cap. 6, 7. [vi. 222.]
De Civ. Dei, cxxi. cap. 26. [vii. 649.]

God became shops to get money: and silly souls were borne in hand, that nothing was more necessary to be bought. Indeed there was nothing more gainful for these men to sell.

M. HARDING.

Well railed. If your reasons or authorities were so pithy, as your mocks and scoffs be spiteful, ye were to be heard. But thanks be to God, that such shewd beasts have short horns. Now to St. Augustine.....And as Festus said to St. Paul, "Hast thou appealed to Cæsar? To Cæsar shalt thou go;" so say we to you, though not having that authority over you which Festus had over St. Paul. To Augustine ye refer this matter, and by Augustine shall ye be judged. Acts xxv. 12.

a It was a good point of skill, with a good countenance, to pass them over.
b Untruth. It shall be shewed. Read the answer. O, so careful this good man is for our cares.

I would allege unto you sundry places of the ^ascriptures, which may sufficiently prove purgatory to a Christian man, that is not contentious, but that will we do hereafter as occasion serveth. Now to St. Augustine. We say plainly, that St. Augustine affirmeth purgatory, and that it ^bcannot be shewed where he doubteth of it, much less where he utterly denieth any such to be. In sundry places of his works he expoundeth the words of St. Paul to the Corinthians of purgatory, where the apostle saith, that the works which he builded upon the foundation (which is Christ) shall be tried by fire.....In the 21st book *De Civitate Dei*, after that he hath declared his judgment touching pains of divers sorts, which men suffer for sins committed, he saith thus: "But pains temporal some suffer in this life only: some after their death: some both now and also then, yet before that most severe and last judgment....."

St. Augustine affirmeth purgatory in plain and express words. 1 Cor. iii. 13.

May it therefore please you, sirs, to read St. Augustine in some such places, (for to read all that he hath written to that end were very much, and a great let to your domestical cares,) and I think verily ye will secretly agree in judgment with us, though, for shame and consideration of the stage ye play your part on, openly the same ye will not confess.....And therefore in his book *De Hæresibus ad Quodvultdeum*, he condemneth Aërius of heresy, (and so consequently all others that be of his opinion,) because to the heresies of the Arians he had added this also, that none ought to pray or make oblation for the dead.....

c Untruth, manifest. Read St. Augustine's words in the answer.

Where ye make St. Augustine very uncertain in this point, as though he said sometime, there is such a certain place, sometime there may be such a one, sometime he doubted of it, sometime plainly denied any such to be; either ye understand not St. Augustine, or ye say contrary to your own knowledge. Verily ye be too bold with him. ^cFirst that he denieth purgatory, that is false. And where ye allege *hypnognostica* in the margin of your book, read it once again at my request, and yourselves will say, Lib. 5. Hypnognosticon. [x. app. 40.]

the place proveth not your purpose. The author of that work, whether he were St. Augustine, which Erasmus believeth not, or whosoever he was, denieth not purgatory: but that after the day of general judgment there is any place of everlasting rest or pain, but the kingdom of heaven and hell, that he denieth. Which we also deny. And there he speaketh against the Pelagians, who, as St. Augustine writeth of them, *ad Quodvultdeum*, promised to infants dying without baptism a certain everlasting and blessed life without and besides the kingdom of God: which heresy in sundry places he reproveth. It seemeth the word *purgatorium*, noted in the margin of that book ^d by the unlearned printer, beguiled you: which sheweth how profoundly ye be seen in the doctors.....The thing he doubted of, touching this matter, is this: Whether those temporal pains do only punish for the ^e satisfaction of the justice of God, or also do purge and correct the souls of the dead in such wise, as temporal pains are wont to do in this life.....But now, whether the smart and sorrow of things left behind, which proceeded in this life of carnal affection, remain also to the souls after their departure from the body, whereof St. Augustine sheweth himself to stand in doubt in *Enchiridio ad Laurent.* cap. 68 and 69; and whether the fire which souls feel in purgatory as it paineth them, ^f so also do by degrees diminish and correct those venial and secular affections, which they carried with them at their death; or whether death itself do so end them, as there remain not any correction of the mind yet being vicious, but only the punishment of the sin past: that is the thing whereof St. Augustine ^g seemeth to have doubted. In effect his question is, whether the fire of purgatory be not ^h double: the one which punisheth the venial sin past, the other which diminisheth and taketh away the affection of sin yet remaining. Of the first he doubteth not: of the other he saith: *Non redarguo quia forsitan verum est*: "I say not against it, for peradventure it is true."

Hæres. 88.
[viii. 25.]

What is that
St. Augustine
doubted of
touching
purgatory.

[Enchir. vi.
222.]

De Civitat.
Dei, lib. 21.
cap. 26. [vii.
649.]

^d Untruth.
For the margin was so noted by Erasmus.
^e Untruth, blasphemous against the blood of Christ. Read the answer.

^f O grave commentary, and a wise matter to be called in question.

^g This whole matter is concluded with seeming and likelihood.

^h Double fire in purgatory: double folly.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

We rail at you, M. Harding, even as Christ railed at certain others, in whose steps ye seem to tread, for that they had made of the house of God a cave of thieves.

The places of the scriptures, which ye thought it best to pass over, and whereby your *purgatory* by your judgment undoubtedly may be proved, if a man be not very contentious, I trow be these: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, ^{John v. 24.} He that heareth my word, and believeth in him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into damnation; but hath passed from death unto life." Or that Esay the prophet saith of Christ: "He was wounded for our ^{Isaiah liii. 5.}

transgressions, he was broken for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we were made whole." Or that St. Paul saith: "Christ hath taken the obligation, that was against us, and hath fastened it unto his cross." Or that St. John saith: "Blessed be the dead, that die in the Lord: Even so, saith the Spirit, for they rest from their labours; and their works follow them." He saith not, they be in purgatory: but, *They rest from their labours.* And again: "They shall hunger no more, they shall thirst no more. For the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall govern them, and shall lead them" (not into *purgatory*, but) "unto the lively fountains of waters: and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes." These, or such other like places, I trow, they be, whereby ye assure yourself so certainly of your *purgatory*.

"But unto St. Augustine we have appealed, and to St. Augustine," ye say, "we shall go." Howbeit, if ye consider the matter well, ye shall find that our appeal lieth not unto St. Augustine. It had been more indifferent dealing to have said with St. Bernard: *Ad evangelium appellasti, et ad evangelium ibis*: "*Ye have appealed unto the gospel, and to the gospel ye shall go.*"

Bernar. in
Cantica,
serm. 65.

Dist. 29. Sci-
endum.

Augustin. ad
Laurent. cap.
67. [leg. cap.
69. vi. 222.]
Augustin. in
8 Quæst. ad
Dulcitium,
quæst. 1. [vi.
128.]

As for St. Augustine, notwithstanding his authority be great, and his learning deep, yet in these cases, as it shall well appear, he can be but a doubtful judge. And a doubtful judge, so far forth as he doubteth, is no judge. Your own canon telleth you: *In erroris labyrinthum nonnulli intrincedo impingunt, cum ante judicant, quam intelligant*: "Many men giving judgment before they can understand, by entangling themselves, fall into a maze of error." For how can he pronounce sentence of that, he confesseth, he knoweth not? or how can he assure us, that is not able to assure himself? Touching the certainty of this doctrine, to allege one or two places out of many, St. Augustine writeth thus: *Tale aliquid, etiam post hanc vitam fieri, incredibile non est: et utrum ita sit, quæri potest*: "Some such thing" (he meaneth the fire of purgatory) "to be after this life, it is not incredible: and whether

it be so or no, ^a it may be a question²⁹.” Again: *Quod spiritus defunctorum, &c. ignem transitorie tribulationis inveniant, non redarguo: quia forsitan verum est:* “That the spirits of the dead find a fire of transitory tribulation, I reprove it not: *for ^b perhaps it is true.*” Again: *Sive ergo in hac vita tantum homines ista patiuntur, sive etiam post hanc vitam talia quædam judicia subsequuntur, non abhorret, ^c quantum arbitror, a ratione veritatis iste intellectus hujus sententiæ:* “Therefore whether men suffer such things only in this life, or else some such judgments follow even after this life, ^d *as much as I think,* the understanding of this sentence disagreeeth not from the order of the truth.”

And again he saith: *Quis sit iste modus, et quæ sint ista peccata, quæ ita impediunt perventionem ad regnum Dei, ut tamen sanctorum amicorum meritis impetrent indulgentiam, difficillimum est invenire: periculosissimum definire. Ego certe usque ad hoc tempus, cum inde satagerem, ad eorum indaginem pervenire ^e non potui:* “What mean this is, and what sins these be which so let a man from coming unto the kingdom of God, that they may notwithstanding obtain pardon by the merits of holy friends, it is very hard to find, and very dangerous to determine. Certainly *I myself,* notwithstanding great study and travail taken in that behalf, *could never attain to the knowledge of it.*” Thus touching *purgatory*, St. Augustine saith: “Whether there be any such place after this life, or no, it may be a question: perhaps it is true: as much as I think: I cannot tell: I could never attain to the knowledge of it.”

By these it is plain, that St. Augustine stood in doubt hereof, whether there be any such *purgatory fire*, or no. Therefore undoubtedly he took it neither for an *article of the Christian faith*, (for thereof it had not been lawful for him to doubt,) nor for any *tradition of the apostles*.

Ye say, “St. Augustine never doubted whether there were any such place of purgatory, or such fire, or no: but only whether the torments there do satisfy the justice of

²⁹ [Exactly the same words are found in the Enchiridion ad Laurent. and in the 8 Dulcitii Quæstiones.]

God for sin, or no: and whether the same torments do by degrees diminish the venial sins and secular affections which the parties carried with them, or no." These, you say, were St. Augustine's doubts. Notwithstanding, what should any question be raised hereof? Plato, and Virgil, and other heathen writers, from whom this doctrine first flowed abroad, would soon have put you quite out of doubt. Virgil hereof amongst others saith thus:

Æneid. vi.
735.

*Quin et supremo cum lumine vita relinquit,
Non tamen omne malum miseris, nec funditus omnes
Corporeæ excedunt pestes: penitusque necesse est
Multa diu concreta, modis inolescere miris.
Ergo exercentur pœnis, veterumque malorum
Supplicia expendunt: alicæ panduntur, inanes
Suspensæ ad ventos: aliis sub gurgite vasto
Infectum eluitur scelus, aut exuritur igni.*

But read you St. Augustine, M. Harding: you, I say, that, to use your own words, "are so profoundly seen in all the doctors," that ye may boldly despise all others whatsoever: read, I say, St. Augustine: examine better the places, and weigh the words: and ye shall find, that he never neither mentioneth nor toucheth any of these your pretty phantasies, but saith plainly: "Whether it be so, or no, it may be a question: I reprove it not: for perhaps it is true."

And are ye so *profoundly* seen in all the doctors and scriptures, M. Harding, that ye think there is either *fire*, or *water*, or any other *creature*, wherewith to satisfy the justice of God against sin, saving only the "blood of the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world?" Or think you, that St. Augustine would turn us from the satisfaction of Christ, and send us to seek for any other? Certainly St. Augustine himself saith: *Valeat mihi ad perfectionem liberationis tantum pretium sanguinis Domini mei: "Let only the price of the blood of my Lord avail me to the perfection of my delivery."*

Augustin. in
Psalm. xxv. [lv.
109.]

Augustin. de
Verbis Dom.
ser. 59. [v.
466.]

Again he saith: *Quando aliquis se converterit ad Deum [l. ad fidem ipsius]prorsus illi omnia dimittuntur. Nemo*

sit sollicitus, quod aliquid ei non dimittatur: "Whensoever any man turneth himself unto God, all things utterly are forgiven him. Let no man be doubtful, lest *any thing haply be not forgiven*." Chrysostom imagineth God thus to say of a sinner: *Unum tantum requiro, ut confiteatur peccata, et ab eis desistat: nec ultra infero penam peccatis*: "This thing only," saith God, "I require of a sinner, that he confess his sins" (unto me), "and leave the same. *Afterward I lay no more punishment upon his sins*." Likewise again he saith: *Ego fidejubeo: si quis nostrum recedat a peccatis ex animo, et vere promittat Deo, se ad illa non rediturum, nihil Deum requisitum ad satisfactionem*: "I will stand bound in God's behalf: if any of us forsake his sins with all his heart, and make true promise unto God that he will no more return unto them, that then God *shall require nothing else unto satisfaction*." He, that knoweth not thus much, hath no great cause to vaunt himself of his *profound knowledge in the doctors*. But if God's justice against your sin be fully satisfied by the blood of Christ; if the *only price of our Lord's blood have wrought the perfection of your delivery*; if there remain *nothing unforgiven*; if God require *no further punishment*; what should you seek for other satisfaction in your painted fires and smokes of purgatory?

To conclude, ye say thus: "In effect, St. Augustine's question is, whether the fire of purgatory be not double." Oh, M. Harding, if ye were simple, and meant simply, ye would not so vainly double the point. I beseech you, what *double fire of purgatory* meant St. Augustine? or, where was he ever so *double* in dealing? By your *double divinity*, and *profound knowledge in the doctors*, ye have at the last skilfully found out a *double purgatory fire*, and a *double purgatory*. Howbeit, as you are now troubled about the *fire of your purgatory*, so were some others of your friends, not long sithence, as much troubled about the *water*. Sir Thomas More said, and held for certain, that in all *purgatory* there is no *water*; no, not one drop: and that, he said, he would prove by the words of the prophet Zachary: *Eduxisti vinctos tuos de lacu, in quo non erat aqua*: Zech. ix. 11.

Chrysost. in
Genes. hom.
44. [iv. 450.]

Chrysost. de
B. Philo-
nio. [l. 499.]

Sir Thomas
More. [Sup-
plic. of Souls;
Works, p.
317. col. 2.]

"Thou hast delivered thy prisoners out of the dungeon, wherein *there was no water*."

The bishop
of Rochester.
[Opp. col.
721.]

Psal. lxxvi. 12.

[Roffens.
Opp. col.
730.]

[Suppl. of
Souls, p. 337,
col. 2.]

Of the other side Roffensis saith: "Yes, there is in *purgatory* good store of *water*. And that, he saith, he can prove by the prophet David: *Transivimus per ignem et aquam: et eduxisti nos in refrigerium*: "We have passed through *fire* and *water*: and thou hast brought us forth into a place of refreshing." Albertus and Roffensis say: "The executioners and ministers of *purgatory* be *holy angels*." Sir Thomas More saith: "Out of doubt they be no *angels*, but very *devils*." So handsomely these dreams agree together.

Augustin.
Hypognost.
lib. 5. [x. app.
40.]

No third
place.

To return to the matter. Where ye say, "We much mistook the place of St. Augustine, being deceived by the ignorant note in the margin;" where also ye so pleasantly sport yourself with our *profound knowledge in the doctors*: the words of St. Augustine that ye mean be these: *Primum locum fides catholicorum, divina autoritate, regnum credit esse cœlorum; unde non baptizatus excipitur: secundum, gehennam; ubi omnis apostata, et a Christi fide alienus, æterna supplicia experietur: tertium penitus ignoramus: imo, nec esse in scripturis sanctis inveniemus*: "The first place the catholic faith, by God's authority, believeth to be the *kingdom of heaven*; from whence whosoever is not baptized is excluded: *the second place* the same catholic faith believeth to be *hell*; where all renegades, and whosoever is without the faith of Christ, shall taste everlasting punishment: *as for any third place, we utterly know none: neither shall we find in the holy scriptures that there is any such*³⁰." If these words make not against your *purgatory*, yet truly in any appearance they make but slenderly for your *purgatory*. St. Augustine saith: "*Any other third place*" (after this life, besides heaven and hell) "*we utterly know none. Neither can we find in the holy scriptures that there is any such.*"

But if all these three places, *heaven*, *hell*, and *purgatory*, had been certainly known, and universally received

³⁰ [The libri Hypognosticœon are not by St. Augustine.]

in the church, and yet besides *these three places*, the Pelagian heretics would have devised, as you imagine, another several place, to receive the souls of such children as departed out of this life without baptism, then could not St. Augustine have truly said, *Tertium locum ignoramus*: "*We know no third place*:" but rather he should have said, *Quartum locum ignoramus*: "*Fourth place we know* Fourth place. none." For by your judgment, the doubt had been not of the *third place*, but of the *fourth*. And it had been a great oversight for St. Augustine, in the reckoning only of *four places*, to have forgotten one; and specially such a *one* too, as hath been found more gainful of late years than the other *three*. But his words be plain: "Heaven we know, and hell we know: but any third place, besides heaven and hell, we know none."

This word *purgatorium* was noted in the margin, not by the *printer*, as you say, but by Erasmus, a man of famous memory, whose name, for learning and judgment, hath at all times among the learned been much esteemed: with whom your young Louvanian *clergy* may not well compare, in the *profound knowledge of the doctors*, without great blushing. And thus much touching this one place of St. Augustine, wherein it hath pleased you so deeply to charge us with gross ignorance. But for better trial of his judgment herein, ye should have considered, what he hath written otherwheres to like purpose.

In his Epistle to Hesychius he saith thus: *In quo quæ-* Augustin. Epist. 80. [ii. 743.]
que invenerit suus novissimus dies, in hoc eum comprehendet
mundi novissimus dies. Quoniam qualis in die isto quis-
que moritur, talis in die illo judicabitur: "In what state
his own last day shall find each man, in the same state the
last day of the world shall find him. For such as every
man in this day shall die, even such in that day shall he
be judged." Again: *Qualem invenit Dominus cum hinc* Augustin. in Apocal. hom. 11. [iii. app. 173.]
vocat, talem et judicat: "*As our Lord findeth a man when*
he calleth him hence, even so he judgeth him ³¹." And again: Augustin. [7. Fulgent.] ad Petrum Diacon. cap. 3. [vi. app. 26.]
Qui in hac vita Deo non placuerit, habebit quidem pœnitentiam
in futuro sæculo de malis suis: sed indulgentiam in
conspectu Dei non inveniet. Quia etsi erit ibi stimulus

³¹ [Supra vol. v. p. 174, note 4.]

pœnitudinis, nulla tamen erit correctio voluntatis: “Whoso in this life shall not please God, shall in the world to come have repentance for his sins: *but pardon in the sight of God he shall not find.* For although there shall be there the prick of repentance, yet there shall be no amendment of the will ³².” Again he saith: *Unusquisque cum causa sua dormiet, et cum causa sua resurget*: “Every man shall die with his own cause, and rise again with his own cause.”

Augustin. in
Johan. tra. t.
49. [iii. pt. 2.
623.]

Olympiod. in
Eccles. cap.
9. [leg. cap.
11. p. 140.]

Olympiodorus saith: *In quocunque loco, &c. deprehendetur homo cum moritur, in eo gradu atque ordine permanet in æternum*: “In what place or state soever a man shall be found when he dieth, in the same state and degree shall he remain for ever.”

But to reckon up all that might be said in this behalf, it would be long. A simple man, M. Harding, without any profound knowledge of the doctors, may easily see, that these sayings will hardly stand with your doctrine of purgatory.

[Roffensis
cont. Luther.
apud] Poly-
dor de In-
ventorib. lib.
8. cap. 1. [p.
456.]

Your own Roffensis saith: *Nemo nunc dubitat orthodoxus, an purgatorium sit: de quo tamen apud priscos vel nulla, vel quam rarissima fiebat mentio. Sed et Græcis ad hunc usque diem non est creditum. Quamdiu enim nulla esset [leg. fuerat] cura de purgatorio, nemo quæsit indulgentias*: “No catholic man now doubteth of purgatory: whereof notwithstanding among the ancient fathers there is either no mention at all, or very seldom. Yea even until this day the Grecians believe it not. For so long as there was no care for purgatory, no man sought after pardons.” By which witness it appeareth, that pardons and purgatory were brought in jointly both together. And as the case now standeth, and as most men think, the pope could be contented to lose both heaven and hell, to save his purgatory.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 17. Divis. 1.

[S. August.
ep. 119. ad
Januar. tom.
ii. 142.]

³³ As touching the multitude of vain and super-^[Vol. iv. p. 25.]fluous ceremonies, we know that St. Augustine did

³² [This work “De Fide ad Petr. Diac.,” is not by St. Augustine, but by Fulgentius, (A. D. 507.)]

intended in the 30th canon, and expressly quoted as from “the Apology of the Church of England,” the canon thus recognising that book’s authority.]

³³ [This probably is the place

grievously complain of them in his own time: and therefore have we cut off a great number of them, because we know, that men's consciences were encumbered about them, and the churches of God overladen with them. Nevertheless we keep still, and esteem, not only those *ceremonies*, which we are sure were delivered us from the apostles, but some others too besides, which we thought might be suffered without hurt to the church of God: for that we had a desire, that all things in the holy congregation might, as St. Paul commandeth, *be done with comeliness, and in good order*. But as for all those things, which we saw were either very superstitious, or utterly unprofitable, or noisome, or mockeries, or contrary to the holy scriptures, or else unseemly for sober and discreet people, whereof there be infinite numbers nowadays, where the Roman religion is used³⁴: these, I say, we have utterly refused without all manner exception, because we would not have the right worshipping of God to be any longer defiled with such follies.

M. HARDING.

St. Augustine, whom ye allege wrongfully against the ceremonies of the catholic church, speaketh only of the cutting away of such manners and rites as be crept into some one particular country, neither contained in holy scriptures, nor established by councils of bishops, nor confirmed by custom of the whole church. But how prove you by that place, that you may pull down altars.....and images....., disallow the vow of poverty....., lent, oil, &c.? St. Augustine referreth the taking away of any custom or manner unto due authority, exhorting it to be done, *ubi facultas tribuitur*: "where power is given to do it. Neither else may it be done lawfully at all, &c." Ye think we have many ridiculous and fond things in our ceremonies. If we had, ^a as indeed we have not, would ye laugh at them, as Cham did at the nakedness of his father Noe, &c.? Laugh on, ye cursed Chananee: but we will dance before the ark: we will ^b shear our head with Paul, &c.

^a Untruth. For St. Augustine, speaking of his time, saith, *Tam multis praesumptionibus ita plena sunt omnia*, &c.

^b Then be ye circumcised, as Paul was. For this was only a Jewish ceremony.

³⁴ [Lat. "in papatu."]

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

This matter had been over cold, had not M. Harding a little inflamed his choler in the end, and cried out upon his *cursed Chananees*. His altars, his images, his vows, his lents, and his oils, be answered sufficiently otherwheres. St. Augustine's words concerning this matter are pregnant and plain: *Hoc nimis doleo, quia multa quæ in divinis libris saluberrime præcepta sunt, minus curantur: et tam multis præsumptionibus sic plena sunt omnia, &c.*: "This thing grieveth me, that so many things wholesomely commanded in the holy scriptures, are not regarded: and all things are full of so many *presumptions*, &c." And again:

Augustin. in
Epist. 119.
[ii. 142.]

Augustin. in
eadem Epist.
[ibid.]

Quamvis ista contra fidem non sint, tamen ipsam religionem, quam paucissimis et manifestissimis celebrationum sacramentis misericordia Dei liberam esse voluit, servilibus oneribus ita premunt, ut tolerabilior sit conditio Judæorum: qui etsi tempus libertatis non agnoverint, legalibus tamen sarcinis, non humanis præsumptionibus subjiciuntur: "Albeit these things be not against the faith, yet with *servile burdens* they so oppress our very religion, which God of his mercy would have to be free, under *very few*, and *most manifest* sacraments of divine service, that the state of the Jews is much more tolerable," (than the state of the church of Christ.) "For the Jews, notwithstanding they knew not the time of liberty, yet were they subject to the packs and burdens of the law" (of God); "and not unto the *devices and presumptions* of men."

Of such *devices and presumptions* Chrysostom saith: *Non dicunt, Cur legem Mosi, sed, Cur traditionem seniorum transgrediuntur? Unde patet, eos multa innovasse, cum Deus contra vetuisset, ne quid adderent, aut minuerent. Sed illi, cum timerent ne principatum amitterent, ceu legum latores, ut majores esse viderentur, plurima innovant. Quæ res ad tantam pervenit nequitiam, ut præcepta sua custodirent, magis quam præcepta Dei:* "The Pharisees say not unto Christ, Wherefore do thy disciples break the law of Moses, but, Wherefore do they break the *traditions of the elders*? Whereby it appeareth, that they had

Chrysost. in
Matthæ.
hom. 52. [vii.
520.]

altered many things, whereas God had commanded, that they should neither add, nor diminish. But fearing lest they should lose their authority, as if they had been law makers, to the end they might seem the greater, they altered much. Which thing" (in the end) "grew to such a wickedness, that they kept *their own commandments*, more than the *commandments of God*."

In like manner saith St. Cyril: *Vellent suam doctrinam, et paternas traditiones ab hominibus potius suscipi, atque in admiratione honoreque haberi. Quicquid igitur Christo credentium accesserit, sibi detractum putant*: "The Pharisees would that men should receive and magnify *their doctrine*, and the *traditions of the fathers*: therefore how many soever faithful came unto Christ, they thought so many were lost from them ³⁵."

It is not true, that ye say, "Traditions may not be changed, or abolished without the general consent of the whole church." For ceremonies, as they never grew together at one time in all places, so can they not lightly be abolished together at one time in all places. Socrates saith plainly: *Videtur mihi, multa modo in his regionibus, modo in illis, consuetudinem obtinuisse*: "It seemeth unto me, that many things have been received by custom, *now in one country, and now in another*." Again he saith: *In universum certe, et in omnibus observationibus piarum precum, non possunt duæ ecclesiæ inveniri, quæ prorsus inter se consentiant*: "Verily, to speak universally, in all manner of observations or forms of common prayer, *there cannot two churches be found, that agree thoroughly between themselves*." St. Augustine saith plainly: *Omnia talia, &c. ubi facultas tribuitur, sine omni dubitatione resecanda existimo*: "All such things, in my judgment, ought to be cut off, as soon as just occasion or power is given, *without any manner of doubting*." So saith pope Stephen: *Si non-*

³⁵ [The 7th and 8th books of St. Cyrill. Alex. in S. Johan. are not extant, except a few fragments preserved in the "Catena in S. Johan. per Harlay episc. Maclov." In the mean time a Latin transla-

tion of them was forged by Judocus Clichtoveus. The edition of Paris, 1573, has been used to verify the above reference, a leaf being absent in the Bodleian copy of that of 1546.]

Cyrril. in Johan. lib. 8. cap. 1. [ed. 1573. p. 867.]

Socrnt. lib. 5. cap. 21. [il. 292.]

Ἐμοὶ δὲ φαίνεται ὅτι πολλά κατὰ χώρας συνήθειαν ἔλαβεν.

Socrates eodem loco. [il. 297.]

Augustin. Epist. 119. [il. 142.]

Dist. 63. Quia Sancta.

nulli ex prædecessoribus et majoribus nostris fecerunt aliqua, quæ illo tempore potuerunt esse sine culpa, et postea vertuntur in errorem et superstitionem, sine tarditate aliqua, et cum magna auctoritate a posteris destruantur: “If sundry of our predecessors or elders have done certain things, which at that time might well be done without hurt, and afterward are turned into error and superstition, *without any staggering, and with great authority*, let them be destroyed and abolished by the successors.” And pope Damasus saith: *Quod ratione caret, extirpare necesse est:* “Whatsoever wanteth reason, must of necessity be rooted out.”

Dist. 68. Choro-
repscopi.

We laugh not, as ye say, M. Harding, *at the nakedness of our father.* Our Father is in heaven, the Father of light, the God of glory: and in him there is no nakedness. We laugh not at any of these things, but we say with St. Augustine, as it is alleged before: *Hoc nimis doleo, &c.:* “This thing very much grieveth me, that so many things, wholesomely commanded in the holy scriptures, are not regarded: and that all things are full of so many presumptions:” and that, as St. Chrysostom saith, “These things are called upon, and more regarded, than the laws and *commandments of our Father.*” Our Father saith of you, and of your fellows: *Volunt facere, ut obliviscatur populus meus nominis mei propter somnia sua:* “They will cause, that my people shall forget my name, *for love of their dreams.*” Our Father saith: “Two evils have my people done; they have forsaken me the fountain of the water of life, and they have ript up to themselves broken cisterns, that can hold no water.” Our Father saith: “What is chaff unto the corn?” “Who hath required these things at your hands?” To be short, hereof Christ himself saith thus: “Every plant, that my *heavenly Father* hath not planted, shall be plucked up by the roots.”

Augustin.
Epist. 119.
[ii. 142.]

Chrysost. in
Matt. hom.
52. [vii. 5.]

Jer. xxlii. 27.

Jer. li. 13.

Jer. xxlii. 28.

Isaiah i. 12.

Matt. xv. 13.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 18. Divis. 1.

We make our prayers in that tongue which all our people, as meet is, may understand, to the end they may (as St. Paul counselleth us) take common

1 Cor. xiv.

[Vol. iv. p.
26.]

commodity by common prayer, even as all the holy fathers and catholic bishops, both in the Old and New Testament, did use to pray themselves, and taught the people to pray too: lest, as St. Augustine saith, "like parrots and ousels we should seem to speak that we understand not." Neither have we any other *Mediator* and *Intercessor*, by whom we may have access to God the Father, but only Jesus Christ, in whose only name all things are obtained at his Father's hand. But it is a shameful part, and full of infidelity, that we see every where used in the churches of our adversaries, not only in that they will have innumerable sorts of *mediators*, and that utterly without the authority of God's word; (so that, as Jeremy saith, "The saints be now as many in number, or rather above the number of the cities;" and poor men cannot tell, to which saint it were best to turn them first: and though there be so many as they cannot be told, yet every one of them hath his peculiar duty and office assigned unto him by these folks, what thing they ought to ask, what to give, and what to bring to pass;) but besides this also, in that they do not only wickedly, but also shamefully call upon the *Blessed Virgin*, Christ's mother, to have her *remember that she is the mother*, and to *command her Son*, and to use a *mother's authority over him*³⁶.

[St. August.
in Psalm. 18.
Enarr. 2.
tom. iv. 81.]

[Jer. ii. 28.
and xi. 13.]

[Bernard.]

³⁶ [These citations are from various sources. The words "monstra te esse matrem" occur in the hymn "Ave maris stella," Breviar. Rom. part. æst. Offic. B. M. in Sabbat. The form "Jure matris impera tuo dilectissimo Filio" is from Bonaventura Opp. vol. vi. p. 406. See Mr. Tyler's unanswerable work, "Romish Worship of the Virgin," p. 34; also archbp.

Usher's Answer to a Jesuit. In the margin of the original Lat. ed. of the Apology, there is a reference to St. Bernard, but without specifying the passage. That father certainly used many unwarrantable expressions in addressing the Virgin; but the Editor is unwilling to believe that he anticipated the impieties of Bonaventura and Bernardinus.]

M. HARDING.

We have but only one Mediator to salvation, Jesus Christ, by whose merits God is reconciled unto us. But where ye say, that besides the same one Mediator ye have none other that ^a may pray or make intercession for you, that point of false belief ye may keep for yourselves. We had rather hold with ^b St. Paul, who as he prayed for all Christian men, so he doubted not to say to the Corinthians, that he hoped to escape danger, *adjuvantibus vobis in oratione pro nobis*: "By the help of you in prayer for us." If one good man may help another in this life by prayer, whiles he hath yet somewhat of his own to be careful for: much more the saints, which are dissolved, and reign with Christ, can help us with their perfect prayer. Ye can tell (I trow) that St. Hierom made this argument within little of twelve hundred years past. Neither make we them gods, as ye would seem to say by the place (which being spoken by the prophet Jeremy of very idols) ye apply to the friends of Christ; whom David saith to be unto him most honourable, and their dominion to be most strong. There is no cause, why ye should wonder if divers cities do gladly acknowledge some one holy angel, apostle, martyr, or confessor, as their chief patron and friend. For if (as it is written) Michael the archangel was once prince of the Jews, and stood always for the children of God's people; it is not to be doubted but that Christian people have now also their ^c patrons. To this purpose ^d some apply that which is written, *Fulgebunt justi, et tanquam scintillæ in arundinetis discurrent: judicabunt nationes, et dominabuntur populis, et regnabit Dominus illorum in perpetuum*: "The just men shall shine, and like sparks of fire in dry kicks shall run abroad: they shall judge nations, and bear rule over peoples, and our Lord shall reign over them for ever." St. Ambrose is of that opinion plainly, where he saith, writing upon St. Luke, *Sicut angelis præsumt, ita et ii qui vitam meruerint angelorum*: "As the angels be over nations, so they also which deserve the life of angels."

Concerning the offices that ye say we appoint unto the saints, ye must understand, that as God hath shewed by any miracle what good works he hath wrought by this saint rather than by that; so the people desire to obtain of God, by the same saint's prayer, that thing wherein they may ^e conjecture that God hath given him most grace. And because our lady the blessed Virgin Mary hath more grace given to her than any other creature, (except ye can name ^f a greater grace than to be the mother of God,) therefore all Christian nations are most bold to desire in prayer to be relieved by her intercession, and the mediation of her prayer made to her Son Jesus Christ, who (we doubt not) heareth her most gladly, as no less intending to do good by her continually to us, than we are sure that by her he hath done for us those great benefits which continually we do receive, for so much as he took flesh of her. And seeing that Christ is the first begotten among many brothers, we that are called into one

^a This is M. Harding's ledgermain. For we speak only of such mediators as we ought to pray unto.

^b As if St. Paul had ever willed us to pray to saints.

^c Untruth, proceeding of vain dotage.

^d A grave authority, taken out of the very portuise.

^e This is the certainty of M. Harding's prayer. It hangeth of a blind conjecture.

^f It is a greater grace to be the child of God.

There is but one Mediator of salvation, who is Christ only: but the saints his friends be mediators of intercession. 2 Cor. i. 11.

Ps. cxxxviii. 17. [Vulg.]

Saints be peculiar patrons of certain places.

Wisd. iii. 7.

In fine lib. 8. Comment. in Lucam. [i. 1494.]

Intercession of the blessed Virgin Mary.

Rom. viii. 17.

Mary mother to all that love Christ.
John xix. 27. heritage with him, and by him, may take heart to account Christ's mother for our mother, specially whereas he said unto John his disciple, and in him to all the children of grace, "Behold thy mother."

Spiritual familiarity with the mother of God, in excess of mind, and so, vereign devotion.

If now any spiritual man, such as St. Bernard was, deeply considering the great honour and dignity of Christ's mother, do in excess of mind & spiritually sport and dally (as it were) with her, bidding her to remember that she is a mother³⁷, and that thereby she hath a certain right to command her Son, and require in a most sweet manner that she use her right; is this either impiously or impudently spoken? Is not he rather most impious and impudent, that findeth fault therewith? If ever any of you had practised in contemplation any of that sweetness which is in *Canticis Canticorum*, ye should have found, that there the spiritual soul is bolder with God her Creator and Spouse, than St. Bernard ever was with our lady, being but a creature, and a member of the same church with him.

g Open blasphemy is spiritual dalliance. O when will M. Harding confess a fault!

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Ye say, there is one only *Mediator of salvation*; but there are *many mediators of intercession*. And thus with this pretty simple distinction ye convey yourself away invisibly in a cloud. But to cut off quarrels, M. Harding, let us have that *one only Mediator of salvation*: and then afterward take to you your other *mediators of intercession* at your pleasure.

Howbeit, if Christ only be the *Mediator of salvation*, wherefore then do you thus call upon the *blessed Virgin* Christ's mother, *Salva omnes qui te glorificant*? "*Save thou all them that glorify thee*?" Here you intrude upon Christ's office, and make the *holy Virgin a mediator*, not only of *intercession*, as you say, but also of *salvation*.

Addition.

Addition. ☞ M. Harding. "A wrangler will never lack words, &c. When we say to the Virgin, *Save us*, we mean thus: *Pray for us to God that we may be saved.*" ☞ *The answer.* It appeareth well by you, M. Harding, that a wrangler will never lack shift of words. To desire salvation of any creature, and that for glorifying and praising of the same, it is nothing else, but vain and childish blasphemy. We can desire no more of God himself. And yet by wrangling words it must be holpen.

M. Harding, fol. 358, a.

³⁷ [It would seem as if Harding acknowledged the fact, implied in bishop Jewel's reference, that St. Bernard used these expressions.]

When ye say to the blessed Virgin, *Save us*, your meaning is this, as you say, *Pray for us to God that we may be saved*.

1 Tim. ii. 5.

Mediator.

First we tell you, as St. Paul hath taught us, "There is one Mediator between God and man, Christ Jesus being man." Hereunto you make answer: "There are two mediators: the one of salvation, which only is Christ: the other of intercession, or prayer, which" (you say) "may belong to the saints of God." Here I reply, and shew you by your own prayers, and by the practice of your church of Rome, that contrary to your own distinction, you desire *salvation* of our lady, and so make her a *mediator*, not only of *prayer*, but also of *salvation*. Unto this you answer, that by these words, *save us*, ye mean nothing else, but *pray for us*. Thus you can shift *praying* into *saving*, and *saving* again into *praying*, at your pleasure. All this notwithstanding, we must think you deal plainly, and want words, and are no wrangler.

[Brev. aest.]

But if you crave nothing of our lady, but only her prayer, what shall we then do with, *Meritis et precibus suæ piæ matris*³⁸? Here are not only *prayers*, but also *merits*. Must we think, that *merit* and *prayer* in your divinity is all one thing? what shall we do with these words, that were wont to ring in all your churches, *Monstra te esse matrem*? "Shew thyself to be the mother: and let him know it?" That is to say, *Command him: he is thy Son*.

[Brev. aest.
Off. B. M.
in Sabbato.]

Howbeit, perhaps you will likewise turn *commandment* into *prayer*: and thus, when you list, *salvation* is *prayer*, *merit* is *prayer*, and *commandment* is *prayer*. So easily an ill thing may be smoothed. And all this can you defend, and save upright, without wrangling. ☞

Wherefore say ye thus of Thomas Becket, of whose sainthood, for ought that I know, ye may well stand in doubt³⁹:

[Brev. Sa-
risb. ed.
Paris. 1556.
fol. 32. col. 3.]

*Tu per Thomæ sanguinem, quem pro te impendit,
Fac nos Christe scandere, quo Thomas ascendit:*

³⁸ [In the Off. B. M. in Sabbat. "meritis beatæ Mariæ semper and in the Offic. parv. (Brev. part. "virginis.")
æst.), the form is "Precibus et ³⁹ [His sanctity was much

“O Christ, make us to ascend unto heaven, whither Thomas is ascended, even *by the blood of Thomas*, that he shed for thy sake.” Here you seek not only *intercession*, but also *salvation* in the blood of Thomas.

Addition.

Addition. ☞ M. Harding. “This is an objection for a cobbler, as the other was, and not for a divine, whose duty it were to depend of things and not of words, &c. Now because we know it was a most gracious gift of God, that he gave St. Thomas grace to die for his honour, when we desire to be holpen by his blood, representing the memory of St. Thomas unto Christ, &c. Your words be fair, M. Jewel, but your heart, unawares to yourself, doth honour the idol Calvin, more than Jesus Christ, &c. The trim strumpet of Calvin’s setting out pleaseth you well. It is that foul and blind heart of yours, that shall condemn you,” &c. *The answer.* Alas, good Christian reader, that ever man should thus wastefully bestow his words. I am afraid we see a member of him, of whom Daniel saith: *Consurget rex impudens facie*: “There shall rise up a prince with an impudent face,” that shall never be ashamed of any thing, whatsoever he say or do. St. Peter saith: “There is no other name or creature given to men under heaven whereby we shall be saved, but only the name of Christ Jesus.” And therefore the ancient father Origen saith: *Ipse solus est hostia pro peccatis: et ipse est hostia, sancta sanctorum*: “Christ only is the sacrifice for sins: he is the sacrifice, the holy of the holy⁴⁰.” Leo saith: *Nullius insontis occisio propitiatio fuit mundi*: “The death of no innocent was the sacrifice or redemption of the world.” Yet here we are taught to seek our salvation in the blood of Thomas Becket, of whose virtue and innocency we may well stand in doubt. Notwithstanding you tell us, “This was an objection for a cobbler.”

“But it was a most gracious gift of God,” you say, “that he gave this Thomas grace to die for his honour.” “For his honour,” say you? Now for shame, M. Harding,

called in question soon after his death, particularly by the doctors of the Sorbonne.]

⁴⁰ [Origen. The passage here

quoted is from Comm. in Levit. hom. 5. vol. ii. 207. The other reference is to a similar passage.]

M. Harding,
fol. 358 b.
359 a.

Dan. viii. 23.
Antichrist.

Acts iv. 12.

Origen, in
Levit. hom.
4. et 5. [ii.
203 et 207.]

Leo, epist.
81. [l. 83. i.
634.]

advise yourself better, what you write. Perhaps some man of simplicity will believe you. The very true cause of Thomas Becket's death was his ambition, and vanity, and wilful maintenance of manifest wickedness in the clergy, to the great dishonour of God's holy name, as by the writers of that time it doth well appear. For proof whereof, it may please you to read the story of Gulielmus Neubrigensis, that lived in the same age.

It is written, that this Thomas Becket's father was a Jew⁴¹, and a beer brewer of London, and that from his house began a fire in the time of king Stephen, that consumed all the one side of London, from the bridge where he dwelt, unto Temple Bar. Neubrigensis saith, that king Henry the Second "took him into his special favour, and being only the archdeacon of Canterbury, made him lord chancellor of his realm, and so entreated him with all kind of honour, that he seemed to reign as well as the king: and that afterward he promoted him to the archbishopric of Canterbury, and sent him to the council of Tours, then holden in France. Being there, as upon some remorse of conscience, he misliked, and secretly refused the king's gift, and resigned his archbishopric unto the pope, and received it again at his hands, and so secretly and in covert betrayed his prince's right unto a stranger. At his return, there grew a great question within this realm, touching the prerogative of the clergy. The judges complained, that there were many robberies, and rapes, and murders, to the number of one hundred, then presently committed within the realm by ecclesiastical persons, and therefore made request in parliament, that there might be some good consideration had of it, for that they themselves, being temporal ministers, had neither law nor jurisdiction to deal against them. As for the bishops," saith Neubrigensis, "whose part it was to see such disorders corrected of so many thousand wicked priests, they never disgraded

Gulielm.
Neubri. lib.
2. cap. 16.
[p. 169.]

Centum homicidia intra
fines Angliæ,
a clericis
commissa.

Tot millia
talium.

⁴¹ [This is a mistake. Gilbert Becket was a citizen of London of good repute, who accompanied Robert of Normandy to the Holy Land; he converted a Saracen lady

to Christianity, and afterwards married her. See Newsham's "Thomas a Becket and his Contemporaries:" a work which may be here consulted with advantage.]

nor punished so much as one. For they," saith he, "seeking more carefully how to maintain the dignity and liberties of their clergy, than the correction of their manners, think they do good service to God and his church, if they maintain wicked priests against the good order of commonweals: whereby," saith he, "it cometh to pass, that the priests that should shine as stars in the heavens, having free liberty to do what they list, care neither for God nor for man. For redress hereof, the king was earnestly minded to take order by his parliament. All the rest of the bishops, not one excepted, agreed thereunto and confirmed the same under their seals. Only Thomas Becket, the archbishop of Canterbury, stood stiff and stout, and would not yield. Afterward, when he saw the king's displeasure grew against him, in the morning, before he should come to make his answer, he caused the mass of St. Stephen's office solemnly to be sung before him, with this preface, *Sederunt principes*, &c.: 'The kings sat down to speak against me, and the wicked sought to persecute me.' This done, he took his silver cross in his hand, and got him boldly to the court. But perceiving that the king was much moved and misliked his stoutness, the next night following, he fled over into France, and afterward sought aid of the pope. At the last, being reconciled unto his prince, and returning again into England, he brought with him the pope's suspension, and thereby suspended all the bishops of this realm, and would never agree to release them. By mean whereof the whole country being sore disordered, shortly after ensued his death." This is the true story of Thomas Becket. So stoutly he maintained the robberies, the rapes, the murders, and open wickedness of his clergy, and would not suffer any law to pass against them. Neubrigensis saith: "This stoutness in him, I can in no wise commend. He boiled," saith he, "with zeal of justice, but whether it were according to knowledge or no, God only knoweth." All this notwithstanding, M. Harding, you tell us, "That God gave him a special grace to die for his honour, and that by his blood we shall be holpen and saved, and come to heaven." Put

hereto what sense ye will : verily, to use your own words, this divinity is much fitter for a cobbler, than for a grave man of your profession. ➡

Ambros. in
Serm. 6. De
S. Margareta.
[ii. app. 465.]

Wherefore doth St. Ambrose say, if it were St. Ambrose that wrote the book³⁷ : *Reddere debemus sanctis honorificentiam, qui nobis salutem profusione sui sanguinis pepere-runt : qui tam sacra hostia pro nostra propitiatione Domino sunt obliti ?* “ We must yield honour unto the saints, which have procured salvation for us by the shedding of their blood : which also were offered up unto the Lord, so holy a sacrifice for our salvation ?” If we have salvation in the blood of saints, then is not Christ the only mediator of our salvation.

He is no indifferent umpire, that first divideth offices equally between two, and afterward allotteth both offices to one alone.

Notwithstanding the end and office, as well of *intercession* as also of *salvation*, is to reconcile us unto God, and to procure us mercy. But this is Christ’s only office : he reconcileth us unto God : he presenteth us unto the throne of grace. And therefore, as St. Paul saith, he evermore maketh *intercession* for us. And for that cause also he saith : *Unus est mediator Dei et hominum, homo Christus Jesus* : “ There is one mediator between God and man, Christ Jesus being man.”

Augustin.
contra Epist.
Parmen. lib.
2. cap. 8.
[tom. ix. 34.]

“ St. Paul,” you say, “ requireth the people to make intercession and to pray for him.” This is true. And God hath commanded, that all the faithful should pray one for another. But St. Paul never required the people to pray to saints. St. Augustine saith : *Paulus...non facit se mediatorem inter populum et Deum : sed rogat, ut pro se orent invicem omnia membra corporis Christi* : “ Paul maketh not himself a mediator between God and the people : but requireth, that they pray all one for another, being all the members of the body of Christ.” Again he saith of St. John : *Si Johannes ita diceret, Hoc scripsi vobis, ut non*

Augustin. in
eod. lib.
[Ibid.]

³⁷ [The Bened. Edd., who deny neglecta Solemnitate Petri et the genuineness of this homily, Pauli.”] have restored the real title, “ De

peccetis : et si quis peccaverit, mediatorem me habetis apud Deum, et ego exoro pro peccatis vestris, (sicut Parmenianus quodam loco mediatorem posuit episcopum inter populum et Deum,) quis eum ferret bonorum, atque fidelium Christianorum ? quis sicut apostolum Christi, et non sicut Antichristum intueretur ? “ If St. John would say, This have I written unto you, that ye sin not : and if ye sin, *ye have me your mediator* before God, and *I will entreat* for your sins, as Parmenian” (the heretic) “ in a certain place, made the bishop a *mediator* between God and the people, what good and faithful Christian *man could abide him ?* who would look upon him, as the *apostle of Christ*, and not rather think him to be *Antichrist ?*”

Here, M. Harding, your sely^{as} distinction of *intercession* and *salvation* cannot save you. For Parmenian never thought the bishop was a *mediator of salvation*. And yet St. Augustine saith, If St. John would have said so much of himself, he had not been the *apostle of Christ*, but rather should have been judged and taken for *Antichrist*.

Ye think, *the words of the prophet Hieremy, spoken of idols and false gods, may not justly be applied to the saints of God*. Indeed of the *saints’* part, it were great blasphemy to call them idols. For they see God face to face, and evermore be with God in glory. But in respect of your horrible abuses, and vain phantasies, the words of the prophet be rightly applied. For you, in your imagination, of the saints of God have made *idols*, and have so multiplied and increased the same, that the number of them hath far passed the number of all your towns and cities. And therefore the ancient father Epiphanius applieth the like words of the same prophet Hieremy unto the *blessed Virgin Mary*, being then idolatrously abused by the heretics called *Collyridiani*, even as the same *blessed Virgin* and other saints are by you abused now. Thus he writeth : *Ne quis comedat de errore, qui est propter S. Mariam. Tamen* Epiph. lib. 3. hæres. 79. [i. 1065.] *etsi enim pulchrum sit lignum, tamen non est ad cibum. Etsi pulcherrima est Maria, et sancta, et honorata : at non ad adorationem. Hæ vero mulieres, colentes Mariam,*

³⁸ [Selie=paltry ; Jamieson Suppl. Etymol. Dict. 7.]

Ἀνακαίνι-
ζουσι τῇ
τύχῃ τὸ
κέρασμα.

*rursus renovant Fortunæ mixturam, et præparant mensam diabolo, non Deo: quemadmodum scriptum est, Pascuntur cibo impietatis. Et rursus, Et fæminæ terunt pollinem, et filii colligunt ligna, ut faciant placentas oleo subactas reginæ [στρατεία] cæli³⁹. Compescantur a Hieremia tales mulieres: et ne turbent orbem terrarum. Ne dicant, Honoramus reginam cæli: "Let no man eat of this error, touching St. Mary. For though the tree be fair, yet is not this fruit to be eaten. Although Mary be beautiful, and holy, and honourable, yet is she not to be adored. But these women, worshipping St. Mary, renew again the sacrifice of wine mingled in the honour of the goddess *Fortuna*, and prepare a table for the devil, and not for God. As it is written in the scriptures, 'They are fed with the meat of wickedness.' And again, 'Their women bolt flour, and their children gather sticks, to make fine cakes, in the honour of the queen of heaven.' Therefore let such women be rebuked by the prophet Hieremy, and let them no more trouble the world. And let them not say, *We worship the queen of heaven.*"*

Here we see, the words, that were spoken of the heathenish idols, are applied by Epiphanius unto the *mother of Christ*; not to deface the blessed Virgin, but to declare the fond errors of those heretics.

As for the distribution of offices and several duties, limited and appointed to each saint in his degree, it shall be best for modesty's sake to say nothing. St. Augustine speaking of the heathens, from whom this part of your divinity, M. Harding, was first derived, saith thus: *Dicebat, ita esse utilem cognitionem deorum, si sciatur, quam quisque Deus vim, aut potestatem habeat, cujusque rei. Ex eo enim poterimus, inquit, scire, quem cujusque rei causa Deum advocare, atque invocare debeamus: ne faciamus, ut mimi solent, et optemus a Libero aquam, a Lymphis vinum:*

Augustin. de
Civit. lib. 4.
cap. 22. [vii.
103.]

³⁹ [In the Greek of Epiphanius the reading is *στρατεία*, after the Septuagint. Bishop Jewel probably corrected it by the Vulgate which reads "*reginæ cæli.*" The passage, Jerem. vii. 18, runs thus

in our version: "The children gather wood, and the fathers kindle the fire, and the women knead their dough, to make cakes to the queen [marg. *frame*, or *workmanship*] of heaven...."]

“Varro said, the knowledge of the gods is profitable, if a man understand, what power and authority each god hath in every thing. For so, saith he, we may know, whom to call upon, and whom to pray unto: lest haply we do, as certain *mini* are wont to do, that is to say, lest of Bacchus,” the god of wine, “*we beg water*, or of Lymphæ,” the goddesses of water, “*we beg wine*.”

These things, having their beginning among the heathens, have sithence been brought even into the church of God; and all the saints in heaven have been appointed, each one in order, to his several office: lest any one should intrude into another's room. Antoninus saith, in his time, where St. Paul and friar Dominic were painted together, the manner was, under the image of St. Paul, to write these words, *Per hunc itur ad Christum*: “We may come to Christ by this saint:” but under the image of friar Dominic, they wrote thus: *Sed magis per istum*: “Yet much rather by this saint.” Whereby was meant, that friar Dominic's office and authority before God was somewhat better, and of more credit, than St. Paul's.

Whereas ye teach the people thus to pray unto the blessed Virgin: *Monstra te esse matrem*: “Command thy Son:” “Use thy motherly authority over him:” “Let him know thee to be his mother:” “this,” you say, “is no blasphemy, but a spiritual dallying.” Now verily, M. Harding, this must needs be a blessed kind of divinity, that can turn *prayer* into *dalliance*.

One of your beauperes of Louvain, as a man carrying his face in his hand, saith boldly: “These words were never used in your church.” And therefore he saith with good courage: *Interim a bonis istis viris quæro, Cur non nominant illas ecclesias, quæ Virginem matrem tam impudenter appellant? Cur eas inquam non nominant?* “In the mean season,” saith he, “this question I demand of these honest men: Why name they not those churches, *which so impudently call upon that Virgin, Christ's mother?* I say, why do they not name them?” Your modesty herein, M. Harding, is more praiseworthy. You are contented to grant the fact, and pleasantly to excuse it by a *spiritual dallying*.

But ye may tell your said fellow, that this kind of prayer was universally used throughout all your whole church of Rome: the men, women, and children, learned and unlearned, were taught and forced thus to pray: "Thou art the queen of heaven:" "Thou art the lady of angels:" "Command thy Son:" "Shew thyself to be the mother."

Bembus in
Epist. ad
Carolum 5.

Ye may tell him, that cardinal Bembus, sometime the pope's secretary, called the same blessed Virgin: *Dominam et deam nostram*: "Our lady and goddess⁴⁰." Tell him, that Ambrosius Catharinus in your late chapter at Trident, representing, as you say, your whole catholic church, calleth the same blessed Virgin, *God's fellow*, by these words: *Fidelissima ejus socia*: "God's most faithful fellow."

Concil. Tri-
dent, sess. 2.
[Crabb. iii.
938.]

And therefore perhaps Nicolaus Cusanus, a cardinal of Rome, saith: *Hoc cedit ad laudem Dei, et Virginis Mariæ matris, quod ipsa sub principatu authoris mortis nullo unquam tempore fuit.....Non indignit Virgo liberatore qui ipsam absolveret a sententia in Adam et in posteros lata.Maria non est deleta de libro mortis: quia nunquam in eo scripta fuit*: "This thing turneth to the praise of God, and of the Virgin Mary the mother, that she was never at any time under the princehood of the author of death. That Virgin needed no deliverer, that should redeem her from the sentence pronounced against Adam and his posterity. Mary was never rased out of the book of death, for she was never written in it." Here we are taught, that Mary the Virgin is our *lady* and *goddess*, that she is *God's fellow*, and that she had no need to be saved by the death of Christ. What is blasphemy, if this be none? Yet this is the divinity of the clergy of Rome.

Nic. Cusan.
Excitation.
lib. viii. Hoc
cedit. [p.
616.]

Ye may further tell him, that in your council of Oxford, Christ's name is quite forgotten, and left out: and *our lady's name* put in place: for thus it beginneth: *Authoritate Dei Patris, et beatæ Virginis, et omnium sanctorum, &c.*: "By the authority of God the Father, and of the

Concil. Ox-
on, [Mansi
xxii. 1150.]

⁴⁰ [The Editor has not discovered the letter referred to, in any of the editions of Bembus Epistol. to which he has had access.

Harding, however, in his Detection grants, that Bembus called the Virgin "Dea."]

blessed Virgin, and of all saints." Notwithstanding ye may well answer, as before, that all this was no manner blasphemy against God, but only a pretty *spiritual dalliance*: even such *dalliance*, I trow, as St. Paul meaneth by these words, *Sedit populus ad manducandum, et bibendum: et surrexerunt ad ludendum*: "The people sat down to eat and drink: and rose up again to *play, or dally*," that is to say, *to commit idolatry*.

You say: "Our lady, the blessed Virgin, hath more grace given her than any other creature, except ye name a greater grace," say you, "than to be the mother of God." Verily, M. Harding, to be the *child of God*, it is a great deal greater grace, than to be the *mother of God*. St. Augustine saith: *Beatior ergo Maria fuit, percipiendo fidem Christi, quam concipiendo carnem Christi..... Materna propinquitas nihil Mariæ profuisset, nisi felicius Christum corde, quam carne gestasset*: "Mary was more blessed" (or fuller of grace) "in that she *received the faith of Christ*, than in that she *conceived the flesh of Christ*. Motherly kindred could have done Mary no good, unless she had borne Christ more blessedly in her heart, than she bare him in her flesh." And again he saith: *Mater mea, quam appellastis felicem, inde felix est, quia verbum Dei custodivit [al. custodit]: non quia in illa Verbum caro factum est*: "My mother, whom ye have called blessed, therefore is blessed, because she hath kept the word of God: *not because the Word in her was made flesh*."

Augustin. de Sancta Virginate. cap. 3. [v. 342.]

Augustin. in Johan. tract. 10. [iii. pt. 2. 369.]

Therefore saith Epiphanius: *Christus dixit, Quid mihi, et tibi est, mulier? nondum venit hora mea. Quo non putarent aliqui, magis eximiam esse sanctam Virginem, mulierem eam appellavit: veluti prophetans, quæ essent futura in terra sectarum et hæreseon genera: ut ne aliqui nimium admirati sanctam, in hanc hæresim, ejusque deliramenta dilabantur. Est enim ludibrium tota res, et anicularum fabula, et ut ita dicam, tota hæresis tractatio*: "Christ said unto his mother, 'Woman, what have I to do with thee? my hour is not yet come.' Lest any man should think *our lady was of greater excellency, he called her Woman*, as it were prophesying of the kinds and sects of heresies, that were to come in the world. *Lest any man, having too*

Epiph. lib. 3. hæres. 79, contra Collyridian. [1. 1061.]

great opinion of that holy saint, should fall into this heresy, and into the dotage of the same. For indeed the whole matter is but a mockery, and an *old wives' tale*, and soothly to say, nothing else but the *handling of an heresy*."

Origen. in
Lucam, hom.
25. [iii. 962.]

Origen hereof saith : *Si mensuram transcenderit charitatis, et qui diligit, et qui diligitur, in peccato est* : "If love pass the measure of charity, as well he that loveth, as also he that is loved, is in sin."

† Ambros.
ad Roman.
cap. i. [ii.
app. 33.]

But touching the matter itself, St. Ambrose saith : *Ideo ad reges itur per tribunos, et comites, quia homo utique est rex : et nescit, quibus debeat rempublicam credere. Ad Deum autem, quem nihil latet, omnium enim merita novit, promerendum, suffragatore non est opus, sed mente devota. Ubique enim talis loquutus fuerit ei, respondebit illi* : "Therefore we are brought unto the presence of kings by lords and officers : because the king is a man, and knoweth not to whom he may commit his realm. But to obtain God's favour, from whom nothing is secret, as knowing what every man is meet to have, *we need no spokesman, but a devout mind*. For wheresoever such a one speaketh unto God, God will answer him⁴⁰."

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 19. *Divis. 1.*

We say also, That every person is born in sin, and leadeth his life in sin : that nobody is able truly to say, *his heart is clean* : that the most righteous person is but an *unprofitable servant* : that the law of God is perfect, and requireth of us perfect and full obedience : that we are able by no means to fulfil that law in this worldly life : that there is no one mortal creature, which can be justified by his own deserts in God's sight : and therefore that our only succour and refuge is to fly to the mercy of our Father by Jesu Christ, and assuredly to persuade our minds, that he is the *obtainer of forgiveness* for

[Vol. iv. p.
26.]

⁴⁰ [Harding in his Detection alleges some authorities for saint-worship, such as are partly spu-

rious, and partly shew, that the germ of the error may be traced as early as the fourth century.]

our sins : and that by his blood all our spots of sin be washed clean : that he hath pacified, and set at one, all things by the blood of his cross : that he by the same one only sacrifice, which he once offered upon the cross, hath brought to effect and fulfilled all things, and that for that cause he said, when he gave up the ghost, "It is finished," as though he would signify, that the price and ransom was now full paid for the sin of mankind. If there be any, that think this sacrifice not sufficient, let them go in God's name and seek a better. We verily, because we know this to be the *only sacrifice*, are well content with it alone, and look for none other : and, forasmuch as it was to be offered but once, we command it not to be renewed again : and, because it was full and perfect in all points and parts, we do not ordain in place thereof any continual succession of offerings.

M. HARDING.

.....Ye make a sophistical argument, when ye teach, because the law of God requireth of us full obedience, that therefore it cannot be satisfied in this life by any means. For when ye say, It requireth of us full obedience, if ye mean ^a such full obedience as is required only in this life, then conclude ye falsely, that we can by no means satisfy it. But if ye mean such full obedience, ^a as is only performed in heaven, then ye conclude well, that we in this life cannot fulfil such perfection as is required in heaven. But then have ye said nothing to the purpose. For we know what mark ye shoot at, by your doctrine uttered in other places : your meaning is, ^b that no man in this life is able by the grace of God to fulfil the commandments We believe, God commandeth us nothing impossible to us. ^c Otherwise how could he justly punish for not doing that commandment, which by no means we were able to fulfil? We are sure, that God punisheth no man unjustly : for *Non est apud Dominum Deum nostrum iniquitas* : "There is no iniquity in our Lord God....."

Moses speaking of the fulfilling of the commandments of God, which also St. Paul repeateth, saith, "That they are not above us in heaven, neither far from us beyond the sea : but hard by thee," saith he, "is his word in thy mouth and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it." And Christ saith, *Jugum meum suave est, et onus meum leve* : ^d "My yoke is sweet, and my burthen light :"
tur.

a A vain folly.
For God's law was written for men in earth, not for angels in heaven.

b A horrible heresy. St. Augustine saith : *Deus jubet aliqui quæ non possumus facere.*

c A fond question. For God punisheth infants for their original sin : yet are they by no means able to avoid it.

d The cause hereof is God's mercy. St. Augustine saith : *Omnis mandata facta deputantur, quando quicquid non factum est ignoscitur.*

God commandeth not that which is impossible to a man in grace.

Deut. xxx.
14.
Rom. x. 8.
Matt. xi. 30.

e Untruth.
For we make
not God un-
just, but we
confess our-
selves to be
sinners.

and St. John, "His commandments be not heavy.".....He then ^{1 John v. 3.} that saith, we can by no means fulfil the law of God, maketh e God unjust and evil, or impotent, and not able to give so much grace as may help to fulfil his law. Let the discreet reader judge, what blasphemy your words contain.....Bely us no more hereafter. This is our doctrine, better founded in the word of God, and in the tradition of the apostles, and in the custom of the whole church, than that ye shall ever be able to overthrow it. Blaspheme, and bark against it, ye may; overcome it ye cannot.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

All other things here by you touched, M. Harding, I will pass over: thinking it sufficient to note a few words of the *possibility and performance of the law*: and so much the more, for that ye seem therein in some part to renew the Pelagian heretics' old condemned error.

As touching that full and perfect obedience, that is required of us by the law, ye answer, "There are sundry sorts of perfection:" namely, that there is *perfection* in children: *perfection* in men: *perfection* in angels: and *perfection* in God. And further ye say, "That in this life we cannot fulfil such perfection, as is required of the angels of God in heaven." And this answer ye make, touching the obedience and performing of the law: as if ye would say, The law of God was given to angels, and is to be performed, not in the earth, but only in heaven: and, as if God had said to those blessed spirits, "Thou shalt not kill: thou shalt not commit adultery: thou shalt not steal: thou shalt not covet," &c. In your sundry *perfections*, of children, men, angels, and God, I have no skill. The Apology meant only of that *perfection* that is required in man. Howbeit, in every kind they say: *Perfectum est, cui nihil deest*: "That thing is perfect, that is full and absolute, and wanteth nothing."

And here, lest ye should deceive yourself by wrong measure, God himself hath shewed you, what *perfection* he requireth in man. Thus he saith: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy power:" "Thou shalt not turn, neither to the right hand, nor to the left:" "Accursed is he, that standeth not in every thing that is written in the law, to perform the same." And St. James saith: "Whoso offendeth in

Deut. vi. 5.
Matt. xxii.
37.

Deut. xvii.
20.
Deut. xxvii.
26.
Galat. iii. 10.
James ii. 10.

one commandment, is guilty of all." And Christ saith : "Be ye *perfect*" (not measuring yourselves by your own ability, but) "as your Father is perfect, which is in heaven." And yet hereby he meaneth, not the *perfection* that is in God and his angels, but only that *perfection* that is required in man.

St. Hierom saith, the Pelagian heretics, in old times, used the same shifts that you use now. For whereas the catholic learned fathers said, "No man is *perfect* and void of sin," they answered even then, even in such sort as you do now : No man is *perfect* in such degree of *perfection*, as God is *perfect*. St. Hierom's words be these : *Augunt, ad comparationem Dei, nullum esse perfectum : quasi scriptura hoc dixerit* : "They say," (even as you, M. Harding, say,) "that, in comparison of God, no man is *perfect* : as though this were the saying of the scriptures." And therefore he saith unto them : *Nunquid præcepit mihi Deus, ut essem, quod Deus est ? ut nihil inter me esset, et Dominum Creatorem ? ut major essem angelorum fastigio ? ut haberem, quod angeli non habent ?* "I beseech you, hath God commanded me, that I should be *the same that God is* ? that there should be no difference" (in *perfection*) "between me, and my Lord, the Creator ? that I should be above the highness of angels ? or that I should have, that the angels have not ?" It was in vain therefore, M. Harding, thus to borrow the Pelagians' weapons, and to make matter of this *perfection*. For we speak not of angels, but only of men.

Further, to entreat of the *perfect fulfilling and accomplishing of the law*, I mean, so far as the law requireth, the Pelagian heretics herein also said, even as you say, and none otherwise. St. Augustine thereof reporteth thus : *Magnum aliquid Pelagiani se scire putant, quando dicunt, Non juberet Deus, quod sciret ab homine non posse fieri. Quis hoc nesciat ? Sed ideo jubet aliqua, quæ non possumus, ut noverimus, quid ab ipso petere debeamus* : "The Pelagians think themselves cunning men, when they say, *God would not command that thing, that he knoweth a man is not able to do*. And who is there, that knoweth not this ? But

Hieronym.
ad Ctesiphont. contra
Pelagianos.
[iv. pt. 2.
475.]

[Ibid. p. 479.]

Augustin. de
Gratia et
libero Arbitr.
cap. 16. [x.
734.]

therefore God commanded us to do some things, *that we are not able to do*, that we may understand, that we ought to crave of him."

Hieronym.
ad Ctesi-
phon. contra
Pelagianos.
[iv. pt. 2.
479.]

St. Hierom saith unto one of the same Pelagians: *Facilia esse dicis Dei mandata: et tamen nullum proferre potes, qui universa compleverit*: "Ye say God's commandments be easy: and yet ye are able to shew us no man, that ever fulfilled them altogether."

Hieronym.
contra Pela-
gianos, lib. 1.
[iv. pt. 2.
488.]

Therefore again he saith unto them:.....*Noli ponere in cælum os tuum, ut per esse, et esse posse, stultorum auribus illudas. Quis enim tibi concedet, posse hominem facere, quod nullus unquam hominum potuerit?* "Set not thy face against heaven, to mock fools' ears with these words, *be* and *can be*. For who will grant you, that a man can do that thing, that no man ever was able to do?"

Augustin. de
Spirit. et
Liber. cap. 1.
[x. 86.]

Likewise St. Augustine saith: *Dixi fieri posse, ut sit homo sine peccato, si voluntas ei non desit, ope divina adjuvante: sed tamen præter unum, in quo omnes vivificabuntur, neminem vel fuisse, vel fore, in quo hic vivente esset ista perfectio*: "I said, *It is possible that a man may be without sin*, if he want not will, the power of God assisting him: and yet I said, that besides only Christ, in whom all men shall be quickened to life, *there was never man, nor never shall be*, who, being in this life, shall have this *perfection*." St. Augustine saith: "No man can attain to this *perfection*:" and he speaketh of the *perfection*, that is required, not of angels, but of men.

Ye will say, as the Pelagians did, Wherefore then doth Christ say, "Be ye *perfect*?" wherefore doth St. Paul say, "As many of us as be *perfect*," &c.? Hereto St. Hierom answereth thus: *Quid ergo sapimus? imo quid sapere debemus, qui perfecti non sumus? Imperfectos nos esse confiteri, et nondum comprehendisse, necdum accepisse. Hæc est hominis vera sapientia, imperfectum esse se nosse. Atque ut ita loquar, cunctorum in carne justorum imperfecta perfectio est*: "What then do we think, or what ought we to think, that be not *perfect*? We ought to *confess*, that we are *unperfect*, and that we have not yet gotten, nor taken" (that *perfection*) "that is required. This is the true wisdom

Matt. v. 48.?

Philipp. iii.
15.

Hieron. ad-
vers. Pela-
gianos, lib. 1.
[iv. pt. 2.
492.]

of a man, to know *himself to be imperfect*. And as I might say, the *perfection of all just men living in the flesh is imperfect.*"

Again he saith: *Justi appellantur, non quod omni vitio carcant, sed quod majori parte virtutum commendentur*: Hieron. ad Ctesiphont. (ibid. p. 483.)

"They are called just men, not for that they be void of *all manner sin*, but for that they are furnished with the *greater part of virtues*." So likewise saith St. Augustine: *Virtus, quæ nunc est in homine justo, hactenus perfecta nominatur, ut ad ejus perfectionem pertineat etiam ipsius imperfectionis et in veritate agnitio* [*leg. cognitio*], *et in humilitate confessio*: Augustin. ad Bonifacium, lib. 3. cap. 7. [x. 460.]

"The virtue, that is now in a just man, so far forth is called *perfect*, that it pertaineth to the *perfection thereof*, both in truth to know, and in humility to confess, that it is *imperfect*." Again he saith: *Omnia mandata facta deputantur, quando quicquid non fit, ignoscitur*: Augustin. Retract. lib. 1. cap. 19. [1. 29.] "All the commandments of God are accounted to be done, when that thing, that is not done, is forgiven." To conclude, he saith: *Multum in hac vita ille profecit, qui quam longe sit a perfectione justitiæ proficiendo cognovit*: Augustin. de Spirit. et Litera, cap. 35. [al. 36. x. 123.] "He hath much profited in this life, that by his profiting hath learned, how far he is from the perfection of righteousness."

Yet nevertheless we may truly use St. Hierom's words, uttered in the defence and right of this same cause: *Hæc dicentes, non adulamur vitiis, sed auctoritatem sequimur scripturarum, quod nullus homo sit absque peccato. Sed conclusit Deus omnia sub peccato, ut omnium misereatur*: Hieron. ad Agasiam, [1v. 202.] "Notwithstanding we say thus, yet we flatter not vices: but we follow the authority of the scriptures, that there is no man without sin. But God hath shut up all things under sin, that he may have mercy of all." Again he saith: *Perspicuum est, omnem hominem,.....quamvis ad perfectionem venerit, tamen [al. tunc] indigere misericordia Dei: et plenam perfectionem ex gratia, non ex merito possidere*: Hieron. in Ezekiel, lib. 14. cap. 46. [lii. 1048.] "It is most certain, that every man, yea although he be grown to perfection, yet needeth the mercy of God: and that he enjoyeth full perfection, not of his own deserving, but of grace." Even so St. Augustine saith: *Ipsa justitia nostra.....tanta est in hac vita, ut potius peccatorum remissione constet, quam perfectione virtutum*: Augustin. de Civit. lib. 19. cap. 27. [vii. 571.] "Our very

righteousness itself is so great in this life, that it standeth rather in *forgiveness* of our sins, than in *perfection* of righteousness."

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 20. Divis. 1.*

Besides, though we say we have no meed at all ^[Vol. iv. p. 27.] by our own works and deeds, but appoint all the means of our salvation to be in Christ alone, yet say we not, that for this cause men ought to live loosely and dissolutely: nor that it is enough for a Christian to be baptized only, and to believe: as though there were nothing else required at his hand. For true faith is lively, and can in no wise be idle. Thus therefore teach we the people, that God hath called us, not to follow riot and wantonness, but, as

Ephes. ii. 10.

St. Paul saith, "unto good works, to walk in them:" that we are delivered "from the power of darkness, to the end that we should serve the living God:" to cut away all the remnants of sin, and "to work our salvation in fear and trembling:" that it may appear, that the spirit of sanctification is in our bodies, and that Christ himself dwelleth in our hearts³⁸.

M. HARDING.

a No aid or help unto salvation. Otherwise this report is untrue.

b Nazianzen: *Si mercedarius es, tantum expecta mercedem.* De Sancto Baptismo. [tom. i. 699.]

c Is not this a folly, M. Harding? God's truth is no mockery.

With what face can these defenders affirm, that they teach the people to walk in good works, whereas, beginning the treatise of works in this present Apology, they say that we have ^ano help or aid in our works and deeds? For so their Latin word *presidium* doth signify, which in the English is turned into "meed." What, masters, is this the way to make men work well, to tell them beforehand, that their works be nothing worth, and that they help them never a whit? why then let the labourer's proverb take place, "I had rather play for nothing, than work for nothing?" ^bIs there any labourer so mad, as to work for nothing? First ye tell the labourers, that there is no help for them in their works, and then ye cry unto them to labour: ^cyea forsooth, as hard as they list. Is not this to mock God and the world?.....Whereas ye speak to Christian men, to those that be

³⁸ [In the Lat. the words "per fidem" are added.]

baptized, to such as have faith : yet ye tell them they may work as much as they will, ^dbut all in vain, &c. : *ergo*, then although a lively faith cannot be idle, and some true faith is lively, yet in another sense ^ethere is a true faith which is not lively, but idle. Which true faith shall become lively, and have great aid in works, if it will learn to leave idleness, and practise that in will and heart, which it believeth in understanding.

But whereas these defenders would no help or aid to be in Christian men's works, that ^fheresy may not so escape. Christ being demanded of one, what good he should do to obtain everlasting life, said : " If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." To keep the commandments is a work : to enter into life is some help to a man. Therefore it is falsely spoken, that in our works there is no help for us. Again Christ saith, " Whosoever forsaketh his house, or brothers, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands for my sake, he shall receive an hundredfold, and shall inherit life everlasting." St. Paul saith, " God will render to every man according to his works. To those that seek for glory, and honour, and incorruption, according to the sufferance of good works, (he will render) life everlasting.".....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here ye trifle, M. Harding, although not much besides your common wont, yet somewhat above your ordinary. Our doctrine herein is grounded upon these words of Christ, " When ye have done all, say that ye be unprofitable servants, and therefore have deserved nothing." Indeed of late years this hath been the general doctrine of your schools : *Vita æterna est merces debita pro nostris meritis : vita æterna, nisi esset merces debita, esset incerta : quia debitum certum est : misericordia incerta* : " Everlasting life is a reward due for our deservings. If everlasting life were not a due reward, it were uncertain. For due debt is certain : mercy or favour is uncertain." Thus have you utterly drowned the grace of God, and the salvation that we have only in Jesus Christ : and have turned the most comfortable doctrine of the gospel into a dungeon of desperation.

" Then," say you, " let the labourer's proverb take place, ' I had rather play for nothing, than work for nothing.' " Verily, M. Harding, when other reason could not serve you, it was reason your *labourer's idle reason* should take place. Howbeit, if ye will do nothing at God's request, of good will, without reward, but must be hired only for

That good
works help
us.
Matt. xix. 29.

^d Untruth.
For we say
with St. Paul,
Your works
shall not be
in vain in
the Lord.
^e Untruth.
Read the
answer.

^f Untruth.
For it is no
heresy : it is
the faith of
Christ. Read
the answer.

Luke xvii. 10.

your penny, then may your *labourer*, be he never so simple, easily tell you, ye are not the child of God, but only a *hireling*, and a *labourer*. For the natural loving child will obey his father, not for reward, but of love, only because he is his father.

Gregor. Nazianzen. de Sancto Baptismate. [i. 699.]
ἐργασαι τὸ καλὸν, ὅτι καλὸν τῷ πατρὶ πέ-
θεσθαι. Κὰν εἴ σοι μὴδὲν ἔσεσθαι μέ-
λοι, τοῦτο αὐτὸ μισθός, τὸ τῷ πατρὶ χαρίζεσθαι.

Gregory Nazianzen saith : *Si servus es, time plagas : si mercenarius, tantum specta mercedem. At si supra hos es etiam filius, reverere tanquam patrem tuum. Benefacito, quia pulchrum est obsequi patri. Et quamvis nihil aliud futurum sit, tamen vel hoc ipsum erit merces tua, fecisse quod gratum esset patri* : “ If thou be a *bond-slave*, then fear the whip : if thou be a *hireling*, then look only for thy reward. But over and besides these, if thou be a” (natural) “ *child*, then reverence” (God) “ as thy Father. *Do well, because it is good to obey thy Father. Yea, and although thou shalt have nothing else, yet even this shall be thy reward, that thou hast been obedient to thy Father.*”

Hilar. in Psal. cxviii. Caph. [leg. Koph. p. 354.]

St. Hilary saith : *Nos, si semel jejunamus, satisfacisse nos arbitramur : si aliquid ex horreo [Ben. leg. copia] domesticarum facultatum inopi damus, implevisse nos justitiam credimus, &c. Sed propheta totum a Deo sperat : totum a misericordia ejus expectat* : “ If we fast once, we think we have satisfied : if out of the barns of our household-store we give somewhat to the poor, we believe we have fulfilled the measure of righteousness. But the prophet *hopeth all of God : and trusteth all of his mercy.*” Christ saith to his

Matt. v. 16.

disciples : “ Let your light so shine before men,” (not that ye may be rewarded, but) “ that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.”

Augustin. Confess. [lib. 10. cap. 29. i. 184.]

St. Augustine saith : *Minus diligit te, qui diligit aliud præter te* : “ O God, he the less loveth thee, that loveth any other thing besides thee³⁹.” Likewise St. Basil saith :

Basil. in Psal. xxxii. [i. 141.]
μόνην ἔχει τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς σωτηρίας τοὺς οἰκτιρμοὺς τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Qui non fidit suis recte factis, nec expectat ex operibus justificari, solam habet spem salutis misericordias Dei : “ He that trusteth not to his own good deeds, nor hopeth to be justified by his works, hath the only hope of his salvation, the mercies of God.”

Further ye say : “ A true faith may be idle, and utterly

³⁹ [S. Augustin. “ Minus enim te amat, qui tecum aliquid amat “ quod non propter te amat.”]

without works:" and therefore ye think it not true that we say, "A true faith is lively, and can in no wise be idle." Here perhaps ye will set *faith* upon the last, and rack her to a larger size. For so Latomus one of your fellows saith, that Socrates, and Plato, and other heathen philosophers, ^{Illyricus de Sectis, p. 93.} had as good understanding, and *faith* in Christ, as had Abraham. And Andradius, another of your fellows, saith, that the heathen and infidel philosophers had the *righteousness of faith*, and everlasting life. His words be these: *Philosophi, qui ab inani decorum multitudine abhorruerunt, &c.: illos tu illa fide, Deique cognitione destitutos dices, per quam scilicet impius justificatur, et ex qua justus vivit?* ^{Kemnitius in examine Trid. Conc. p. 535. [pt. 1. p. 108.]}

"The philosophers that abhorred and shunned the vain multitude of gods, &c.: wilt thou say, they lacked that *faith and that knowledge of God*, whereby the wicked is justified, and whereby the righteous liveth?" Another of your near fellows saith: *Petrus non fidem Christi, sed Christum, salva fide, negavit:* ^{Copus Dial. 1. p. 51.} "Peter denied not the faith of Christ, but he denied Christ, his *faith nevertheless being safe*." If ye call this *true faith*, M. Harding, that may be found in heathens and infidels, and may well and safely stand with the abjuring of Christ, then without question your *true faith* may be without good works. But St. Paul, whose words we ought rather to credit, saith far otherwise: "He that hath no regard to his own, specially such as be ^{1 Tim. v. 8.} of his household, hath *denied the faith*, and is worse ^{Fidem abnegavit. Tit. i. 16.} than an infidel." Again he saith: "They say, they know God: but by their works *they deny God*." St. John saith: "Whoso saith he knoweth God, and keepeth not his com- ^{1 John ii. 4.} mandments, *is a liar, and the truth is not in him*." St. James saith: "*Faith without works is dead:*" and "*the devil believeth, and trembleth for fear*." ^{James ii. 17. 19.} But a *dead faith* is no more a *true perfect faith*, than a dead man is a true perfect man. As for the *faith of devils*, indeed and verily it is *no faith*.

Certainly St. Augustine saith: *Qui fidem habet sine spe et dilectione, Christum esse credit: non in Christum credit:* ^{Augustin. in Evangel. Joh. serm. 61. [v. 694.]} "He that hath faith without hope and charity, believeth that there is Christ: *but he believeth not in Christ*." Again

Augustin, de
Fide et Ope-
ribus, cap.
23. [vi. 188.]

he saith : *Inseparabilis est bona vita a fide, quæ per dilectionem operatur : imo vero ea ipsa est bona vita* : “ Good life can never be divided from faith, which worketh by love : nay rather that same very faith itself is good life.”

Ambros, lib.
6. epist. 36.
[ii. 1016.]

St. Ambrose saith : *Ubi quis cøperit luxuriari, incipit deviare a vera fide* : “ As soon as a man beginneth to live wantonly, he beginneth to flee from the true faith.”

Origen, in
Epist. ad
Rom. lib. 8.
cap. 10. [iv.
623.]

saith : *Omnis qui credit in eum, non erubescit : erubescit autem omnis qui peccat : (ergo).....qui adhuc ruborem peccati incurrit, credere non videtur* : “ Whosoever believeth in God, blusheth not : but every man blusheth that worketh sin. Therefore he, that yet blusheth for his sin,

Origen, in
Ezechiel.
hom. 9. [iii.
388.]

seemeth not to believe.” Again he saith : *Male credit, quicumque peccat* : “ Whosoever sinneth, believeth ill.”

To be short, St. Cyprian saith : *Quomodo dicit se credere in Christum, qui non facit quod Christus facere præcepit ?* “ How doth he say he believeth in Christ, that doth not the thing that Christ commanded ?”

Nicol. Cusan, Excitationum, lib. 5. [p. 504.]

If ye will believe none of all these, being ancient and learned fathers, yet believe your own doctor Cusanus, a cardinal of Rome. Thus he saith :.....*Non potest mens scire Deum, et non diligere : non potest esse vera scientia Dei, ubi non est charitas* : “ The mind cannot know God, and not love him. There can be no true knowledge of God, where there wanteth charity.”

Hereby it is plain, that *true faith* is lively and workful : and that an *idle faith* is indeed *no faith* at all.

M. Harding,
370 b. 371 a.

Addition. ☞ M. Harding. “ Did not you know the *Addition.* answer, M. Jewel ? Nothing is more common. You bely the scripture. That is the answer to you. And your forefathers, even up to Luther, have always belied it : and being told of it, will not yet amend, no more than the devil whom they follow. A thing may be dead in two sorts, either because it had life in it of his own, or else because it had it of another thing, &c. Now it is to be considered, whether faith hath life in itself, of his own nature, as a man hath, (for then a dead faith is no faith,) or else whether faith have life of another thing, to wit, of charity, and then a dead faith is a true faith, &c. St. James giveth us to

understand, that faith hath life of another thing, like as the body hath life of the soul. For he saith : *Sicut enim corpus sine spiritu mortuum est, ita et fides sine operibus mortua est* : ‘As the body without the soul is dead, so is faith dead without works.’ Not as the man is dead without the soul, but as the body is dead without the soul, so is faith dead without works. But the body being without the soul, is still a true natural body. Therefore faith being without good works, is still a true real faith. And so M. Jewel is tried a liar.” *The answer.* I am weary of your follies, M. Harding. And were it not for some satisfaction of the simple, I would not vouchsafe them of any answer. Whereas I only allege these words of St. James, “Faith without works is dead,” you tell me, that “I bely the scripture. And this,” you say, “shall be mine answer.” Of such hasty answers you have good store. I thank God, I believe the scriptures : I *bely* them not. I would not willingly *bely* a child : much less the everlasting word of God : for I know, it is holy.

But how, and wherein have I so foully *belied the scriptures* ? You answer me : “A thing may be dead in two sorts : either because it had life in it of his own, or else because it had it of another thing. Faith hath life of itself : and faith hath life of charity.” All this may be granted. But what conclude you hereof, M. Harding ? If faith have life of itself, have I therefore *belied the scriptures* ? Behold St. James’ words : thus he saith : “Faith without works is dead ;” of the other side behold my words : thus I say : “Faith without works is dead.” Now compare these words together. I increase nothing : I minish nothing : I alter nothing : I report St. James’ words plainly and simply, as he spake them. With what good countenance then can you so uncivilly tell me, that I have *belied the scriptures* ? Your reader, be he never so friendly bent unto you, must needs doubt somewhat of your dealing. If ye proceed accordingly, you will be able shortly to tell us, that St. James himself hath *belied the scriptures*. For the words, that I speak, and you condemn, be St. James’.

“Faith,” you say, “hath life of another thing, like as

A man without a soul.

James ii. 17.

the body hath of the soul. Not as the man is dead without the soul, but as the body is dead without the soul, so is faith dead without good works." Thus you say. But help us, I pray you, that we may better understand your meaning. Ye speak in parables. We need a commentary. "A man," say you, "dead without a soul?" What meaneth this talk, M. Harding? Ye lay the way for us, I trow, and would entrap us in the dark. Who ever heard of a *man without a soul*? I have sometimes heard of a man without wit, and of words without sense or reason: but of a *man without a soul* hitherto I never heard, unless haply you mean the *man in the moon*.

Now let us view the handsomeness of your distinction. These be your words: "Not as a man is dead without a soul: but as a body is dead without a soul." A man, that had *any soul*, would think there should be some difference between these speeches. "Not as the one," you say, "but as the other." But what if the *one* and the *other* be both one? Consider better of your words, I beseech you. What is a *man without a soul*, but only a bare dead body? or what is such a dead body, but only a *man without a soul*? where was your *soul*, M. Harding, when you devised these distinctions without a difference?

Yet ye tell us: "A body being without a soul, is still a true natural body: *ergo*," say you, "faith being without good works, is still a true real faith." First, M. Harding, you know it is commonly said in all schools, *Omnis similitudo claudicat*. You might soon have found the feebleness of this reason. It will serve you only to mock children. Howbeit, let us use your own grants. You shall see them conclude against yourself. For a *body without a soul*, notwithstanding it be a true natural body, yet hath it neither sense, nor life, but is indeed and verily a *dead body*. Even so your *faith without good works*, notwithstanding any truth or realty ye can give unto it, hath in it neither life nor sense, but indeed and verily is a *dead faith*, and therefore no faith at all.

But who taught you to shape out these pretty similitudes, and so unskilfully to liken *faith* unto the *body*, and

good works unto the *soul*? The wise and learned have rather likened *true faith* to the *soul*, and *good works* to the *body*. For as the *body* hath no life of itself, but only of the *soul*, even so *works* have no life of themselves, but only of *faith*.

Yet you say: "Faith without works is nevertheless a true and a real faith." Verily, M. Harding, so is fire without heat a true and a real fire. Of such a *faith* St. James saith: *Dæmones credunt, et contremiscunt*: "Devils James ii. 19. believe, and quake for fear." If the wicked, without good works, have a true and a real faith, then may you also say, that the *devil* likewise hath a *true and a real faith*. This *faith* is no *faith*, M. Harding. It is only an imaginary, and a mathematical phantasy. It is not that *faith*, whereby we are made the children of God. Hereof St. Paul saith thus: *Habent speciem pietatis: virtutem autem ejus abnegant*: "They have a show and a face of godliness: but the virtue and power thereof they forsake utterly." Of such a *faith* the angel saith in the Apocalypse: "Thou hast a a Rev. iii 1. name of life, and yet art thou dead." Such is *faith without works*, a face without godliness, a show without substance, a name without life.

"M. Jewel," you say, "is tried a liar." And why so? Because he saith, as St. James saith, "Faith without works is dead," and therefore, as St. Augustine saith, "no faith at all." But M. Harding, contrary to St. James' express and plain words, telleth us, that "faith without works is a true and a real faith," and is lively and forcible in itself: and yet is he tried a trusty man. ➡

But you say: "Good works have their reward: and therefore," ye say, "this heresy may not so escape." Whether good works shall be rewarded, or no, it was no part of our question. For we undoubtedly believe the words that are written by St. John: *Opera illorum sequuntur illos*: "Their works follow after them." We believe the words that Christ saith to his disciples: "He, that Matt. x. 42. giveth a cup of cold water to any of these little ones for my sake, shall not lose his reward." We believe that, that St. Paul saith: "Your work shall not be in vain in 1 Cor. xv. 58.

the Lord." We grant, *good works have their reward*: but the same *reward* standeth in mercy and favour, and not in duty.

Thus therefore we say: Considering the weakness, and sinful corruption of our nature, there can be no works in us so pure and perfect, that we may thereby of right, and of duty, deserve everlasting life. And this, M. Harding, is no *heresy*, but the very plain sense and substance of God's word, and the undoubted doctrine of the ancient catholic fathers of the church.

Job ix. 2. Job saith: *Si homo velit contendere cum Deo, non poterit ei respondere unum pro mille*: "If a man will dispute with God, he is not able to answer him one for a thousand."

Job ix. 20. And therefore he saith: *Verebar omnia opera mea*: "I stood in doubt, and was afraid of all my works." Again he saith: "Although I were perfect, yet my soul shall not know it: if I would justify myself, mine own mouth shall condemn me." The prophet Esay saith: "All our righteousness is like a foul stained clout."

Augustin. de Tempore, serm. 49. [v. 821.] Therefore St. Augustine saith: *Non intres in iudicium cum servo tuo. Quid est, Non intres in iudicium cum servo tuo? Non stes mecum in iudicio, exigendo a me omnia quæ præcepisti, et [suppl. exigendo] omnia quæ jussisti. Nam me invenies reum, si in iudicium intraveris mecum. Opus ergo est misericordia tua, potius quam liquidissimo iudicio tuo?* "O Lord enter not into judgment with thy servant. What meaneth that, 'Enter not into judgment with thy servant?' Thus much it meaneth: Stand not with me in judgment, requiring of me all that thou hast commanded. For if thou enter into judgment with me, thou shalt find me guilty. I have need therefore, not of thy upright judgment, but of thy mercy." Again he saith: *Merita quorumlibet hominum quæ sunt? Quandoquidem ille, qui non cum mercede debita, sed cum gratuita gratia venit, omnes peccatores, solus a peccato liber, et liberator, invenit*: "What be the merits of any men? For Christ, that came not with his due reward, but with his grace that was not due, found all

Augustin. epist. 52. ad Macedon. [ii. 538.]

Augustin. de Spirit. et Litera, cap. 33. [x. 119.]

men sinners, being himself only free from sin, and a deliverer of sinners." Again he saith: *Coronat te in miseri-*

cordia et miserationibus. Hoc fiet [al. fit] in judicio: ubi cum rex justus sederit in throno, redditurus unicuique secundum opera ejus, quis gloriabitur, castum se habere cor? aut quis gloriabitur, mundum se esse a peccatis? Ideo illic necessarium fuit commemorare miserationem et misericordiam Domini, &c.: "God crowneth thee with favour and mercy. That shall be done in the last judgment: whereas, when the just King shall sit in his throne, to render to every man according to his works, who shall boast, that his heart is chaste? or who shall boast, that he is clean from sin? Therefore it was needful to make mention of the pity and mercy of our Lord." And again: Opera manuum mearum non commendo. Timeo enim, ne, cum inspexeris, plura invenias peccata, quam merita: "Lord I commend not the works of my hands. For I am afraid, lest, when thou shalt behold them, thou shalt find no sins, than good deservings."

Augustin. in
Psalm. cxxxvii.
[iv. 1533.]

So saith St. Hierom: *Si consideremus nostra merita, desperandum est: "If we behold our own merits, we must be driven to desperation."*

Hieron. in
Isa. lxiv. [iii.
476.]

So saith Origen: *Ego vix mihi persuadeo, ullum opus esse posse, quod ex debito remunerationem deponat: "I do scarcely believe, that there can be any work, that may of duty require reward."* Again he saith: *Dicite vos esse servos inutiles. Nam etsi omnia fecerimus quæ præcepta sunt, non tamen bonum aliquod fecimus. Nec enim, si vere bona essent,.....essemus inutiles..... Omne autem bonum nostrum non proprie, sed abusive bonum dicitur*⁴⁰: "Say ye," saith Christ, "that ye be unprofitable servants. For notwithstanding we have done all things that are commanded, yet have we done no good thing. For, if our doings were good indeed, then were we not unprofitable. But any good deed of ours is called good, not rightly or duly, but by abuse of speech." So saith St. Augustine: *Si Deus vellet pro meritis agere, non inveniret, nisi quod damnaret:*

Origen. ad
Rom. lib. 4.
cap. 4. [iv.
522.]

Origen. in
Matt. tract.
8. [iii. 665.]

Augustin. in
Psalm. xciv.
[iv. 1024.]

⁴⁰ [The quotation corresponds nearly to the "Vetus interpretatio," added in the Ben. ed.]

deserved, he should find nothing, but that he might condemn." Therefore, M. Harding, Waldensis, one of your great doctors, having well and circumspectly weighed the matter of every side, at the last concludeth thus: *Quid dignum facinus, ut participes cœlestibus fieri inveniamur?* Walden. contra Wic. lefam.

Rom. viii. 18. *Apostolo dicente, Existimo, quod non sunt condignæ passionis hujus temporis ad futuram gloriam, quæ revelabitur in nobis: reputo igitur saniores theologum, fidiorem catholicum, et scripturis sanctis magis concordem, qui tale meritum simpliciter abnegat: "What worthy thing do we, that we may be found in the fellowship of the heavenly spirits? The apostle saith, 'I judge, that the afflictions of this time are not worthy of that glory, that shall be revealed in us.' Therefore I take him to be the sounder divine, the faithfuller catholic, and more agreeable to the holy scriptures, that utterly denieth all such kind of merit."*

But ye will say: "If we find ourselves void of merit, how then shall we stand, and be justified before God?" St. John Rev. xxii. [l. vii. 14.] saith: "Blessed are they [l. these] that have washed their robes" (not in their own merits, but) "in the blood of the Lamb." And God saith: "I will give the thirsty to drink of the well of life" (not for his deserts, but) "for nothing."

Rev. xxi. 6. The ancient father Origen saith: *Quia.....omnia conclusa sunt sub peccato, nunc non in meritis, sed in misericordia Dei salus humana consistit: "Forasmuch as all men are shut up, and closed under sin, now the salvation of man standeth not in man's merits, but in God's mercy."* Origen. ad Rom. lib. 9. cap. 12. [iv. 643.]

St. Augustine saith: *Deus in fine.....coronabit nos..... in misericordia et miserationibus* [leg. in miseratione et misericordia]: "God in the end will crown us" (not with the price of our deservings, but) "with favour and mercies."

Augustin. de Verbis Apostoli, serm. 15. [v. 810.] Again he saith: *Pro nihilo salvos facies eos. Quid est, Pro nihilo salvos facies eos? Nihil in eis invenis, unde salves, et tamen salvas.....Quia nihil invenis, unde salves: et multum invenis, unde damnes: "For nothing thou shalt save them. What is meant by these words, For nothing thou shalt save them? (This is the meaning.) Thou findest nothing in them, wherefore thou shouldest save them; and*

yet thou savest them. Thou findest nothing, wherefore thou shouldest save them: but thou findest much, wherefore thou shouldest condemn them.” And again: *Omnes in mortem.....pœna debita præcipites ageret, nisi inde quosdam indebita Dei gratia liberaret*: “Deserved pain would throw all men into death, unless the undeserved grace of God delivered some from it.”

St. Basil saith: *Non erit iudicium sine misericordia: quia non potest homo purus inveniri a sorde: ne si unus quidem tantum dies sit ab ejus natali*: “Judgment shall not be without mercy: for no man can be found pure, and clean from all filth: no, though he be but one day old.” Again he saith: *Hæc est nostra integra et perfecta gloriatio in Deo, quando propriæ justitiæ nos inopes agnoscimus: sola autem fide in Christum justificari*: “This is our full and perfect rejoicing in God, when we acknowledge, that we are void of our own righteousness, and are justified by only faith in Christ.”

So saith St. Hierom: *In Christo Jesu Domino nostro, in quo habemus fiduciam, et accessum, et confidentiam* [leg. in confidentia] *per fidem ejus: non per nostram justitiam, sed per eum, cujus fide nobis peccata dimittuntur*: “In Christ Jesus our Lord, in whom we have boldness and liberty to come” (to God), “and trust, and affiance by the faith of him: not through our righteousness, but through him, in whose name our sins be forgiven⁴⁰.”

Hereof St. Bernard, in most godly and comfortable wise, concludeth thus: *Meritum meum miserationes Domini. Non sum ego inops meriti, quamdiu ille non est inops miserationum. Si miserationes ejus multæ, multus ego sum in meritis.—Hoc totum est hominis meritum, si totam spem suam ponat in Domino*: “My merit is the mercy of God. So long as God is not poor of mercy, so long cannot I be poor of merit. If his mercies be great, then am I great in merits. This is the whole merit of man, if he put his whole affiance in the Lord⁴¹.”

⁴⁰ [This work is not genuine.]

⁴¹ [The first part of this quotation is not out of St. Bernard's

sermon in Psalm. “Qui habitat;” but from the Commentary in Cantica, serm. 61. (tom. iv. 1479.)]

Augustin. de Civit. lib. 14. cap. 1. [vil. 349.]

Basil. in Psalm. xxxii. [i. 135.]

Basil. de Humilitate. [ii. 158.]

Hieron. in Epist. ad Ephes. iii. [v. 1052.]

Bernard in Psal. Qui habitat. [iii. 879.]

This is these defenders' horrible heresy, M. Harding, which (you say) might not so escape your hands.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 21. Divis. 1.*

To conclude, we believe, that this our selfsame ^[Vol. iv. p. 27.] flesh, wherein we live, although it die and come to dust, yet at the last shall return again to life, by the means of Christ's Spirit which dwelleth in us: and that then verily, whatsoever we suffer here in the mean while for his sake, Christ will wipe away all tears and heaviness from our eyes: and that we through him shall enjoy everlasting life, and shall for ever be with him in glory. So be it.

M. HARDING.

a Untruth.
For so the
fathers of the
old law, and
all Christian
infants
should be
utterly ex-
cluded from
resurrection.

Last of all, ye believe (as ye say) that this very flesh shall return to life, and that for the Spirit of Christ which dwelleth in us. There is no doubt but the Spirit of Christ is sufficient to raise up their bodies in whom it dwelleth. But we say, that the raising of our flesh is also assigned in holy scripture ^a to the real and substantial eating of Christ's flesh, because it is written: "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath life everlasting: and I will raise him again in the last day." Therefore the resurrection of the flesh is not only assigned in holy scripture to the Spirit of Christ, but also to the worthy eating of his flesh. And thus we have confuted the doctrine, wherein ye declare your faith: and the chief grounds whereon ye build your new gospel we have disproved.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

[Rom. viii.
11.]

The words, wherein ye find fault, M. Harding, are not ours, but St. Paul's. If they be false, why did he write them? If they be true, why do you blame them? Here ye seem to check St. Paul, and not only us. Ye say: "The raising of our flesh is also assigned in the holy scripture to the real and substantial eating of Christ's flesh." But whence had ye these words, M. Harding? where found ye these scriptures? Dissemble no longer: deal plainly and simply: it is God's cause. For a show ye allege these

John vi. 51.

words of Christ, written by St. John: "He that eateth my

flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath life everlasting; and I will raise him up again in the last day." These words we know: and the eating of Christ's flesh we know: but where is your *real*, and *substantial*, and *carnal*⁴² eating? Where did St. John ever tell you, that Christ's body is *eaten with teeth*, and conveyed further in such gross and fleshly wise into the belly? St. Augustine, expounding the same words, saith thus: *Crede, et manducasti*——: *credere in Christum, hoc est manducare panem vivum*——; *iste panis interioris hominis quærit esuriam*: "Believe thou" (in Christ), "and thou hast eaten" (Christ). "*To believe in Christ, that is the eating of the bread of life.*" This bread requireth the hunger of the inner man." And Nicolas Lyra, one of your own doctors, saith: "These words of St. John pertain nothing to the sacrament." Thus he saith: *Hoc verbum nil directe pertinet ad sacramentalem vel corporalem manducationem*: "This saying" (of the sixth of John) "pertaineth nothing directly to the sacramental or corporal eating⁴³." It was some oversight of your part, M. Harding, to seek to prove the eating of the sacrament by such words, as, by your own doctors' judgment, pertain nothing to the sacrament.

Addition. ☞ "It was more oversight of you, M. Jewel, to blemish your credit by belying my doctor, if Lyra be my doctor. For Lyra never said the words, that you allege, &c. It appeareth, how falsely you have belied Lyra. The words, which you allege, are not the words of Nicolas Lyra, mine own doctor, as you say, but of one Matthias Doring, &c. You have deceived your reader with false forgery, &c. You have also foully corrupted this poor Dr. Doring, with cutting off his words, pretending him to speak of these words of St. John, "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath life everlasting; and I will raise him again in the last day;" which I alleged, whereas indeed he spake only of these special words of St. John, *Nisi manducaveritis carnem Filii hominis*, &c. That the truth may be known,

⁴² [The words "and carnal" also attributed to Lyra, e. g. supra vol. ii. 334, 337.]

⁴³ [This passage is elsewhere

Augustin. in Johan. tract. 25. [iii. pt. 2. 489.] Idem, tract. 26. [ibid. 494.]

Nicol. Lyra in Psalm. ex. [iii. 1300.]

M. Harding, fol. 374, b. 375, a.

and your falsehood detected, &c. The words that you allege, be not Lyra's, but one Doring's," &c.

The answer. Such *errors*, such *oversights*, such *blemishing* of *credit*, such *belying* of doctors, such *deceiving* of readers, such *corruption*, such *falsehood*, such *forgery*. Either there was some marvellous great cause, M. Harding, why ye should thus raise the country with hue and cry, or else your reader must needs think, your head was disordered with some vanity? What was the cause then of all this stir? You say, I have alleged Nicolas Lyra instead of Matthias Doring. This was an error⁴⁴, I will easily grant you. But *falsehood*, or *forgery*, or *belying* of doctors, or *deceiving* of readers, I believe, few sober men would have called it. For what if I mistook Lyra instead of Doring? what could I have gained by all that forgery? Is not the authority of Matthias Doring as good as the authority of Nicolas Lyra? were they not both Franciscan friars, of one order, of one religion, and of one profession? You know, that Nicolas Lyra, Paulus Burgensis, and Matthias Doring, are all three so joined together, not only in one book, but also oftentimes in the one side of one leaf, that, unless a man be very watchful, he may soon take one of them for another. And yet, whomsoever a man shall happen to take of these three, there is small choice in the taking. Such poor advantages must be fain to help you, M. Harding, when you find yourself scanted of better shifts.

But (you say) I have also foully corrupted this poor Doctor Doring. What *poverty* you find in him, I cannot tell. Wise men weigh learning neither by poverty nor by riches. Notwithstanding I doubt not, but poor doctor Doring in his time was thought to be as good a doctor as doctor Harding. But wherein have I so foully corrupted him? Verily, M. Harding, I have neither changed any one of his words, nor altered any part of his meaning. He

⁴⁴ [It is perfectly true, that although printed in the Bible generally called after Nic. Lyra, the Replicæ, (against the additions of Paulus Burgensis,) of which this

forms a part, were written by Matth. Doring, or, as the title-page has it, *Thoryngus*. Lugd. 1589.]

saith, "The words spoken by Christ in the sixth chapter of John belong not directly to the receiving of the sacrament:" and to that purpose I have alleged him. Now therefore, M. Harding, for the better trial of your credit, let us suffer Matthias Doring to tell his own tale. Thus he saith: *Illud dictum ex litera non habet fundamentum. Ideo de sacramentali communione, nec quoad clerum, nec quoad laicum habet vim præcepti ad omnes, secundum verum ejus intellectum: quia ex [leg. in] eodem contextu literæ, declaratur, de qua manducatione et potatione intelligi debeat, videlicet de spirituali: quia sequitur, Qui manducat meam carnem, et bibit meum sanguinem, in me manet, et ego in eo. Quod beatus Augustinus exponens ait, Hoc est manducare illam escam, et bibere illum potum, in Christo manere et Christum manentem in se habere: quod nihil est aliud, quam esse in charitate Christi. Hoc autem.....nihil directe pertinet ad sacramentalem vel corporalem manducationem. Nam hoc verbum fuit dictum antequam sacramentum eucharistiæ esset institutum. Ex illa igitur litera de sacramentali communione non potest fieri argumentum efficax. Primum enim id, de quo agitur, debet esse in rerum natura.....De eucharistia igitur sacramentali, quæ nondum fuit, tam alta sententia proferri non potuit:.....nisi quis curiosus hæreticus diceret, illa verba dicta de usu sacramenti eucharistiæ prognostice per modum prophetiæ. Sed sic dicere, non potest in aliquo passu sacræ scripturæ fundari. Eadem igitur facilitate contemnitur, qua probatur: præsertim quum constet ex evangelii rotundo textu, quosdam huic præcepto satisfacisse, quos constat nunquam sacramentaliter communicasse..... Ideo Augustinus ait, has propositiones simul esse veras: non manducans, manducat: et manducans, non manducat.Dato opposito, sequeretur, neminem esse in charitate, nisi sacramentaliter communicantem: quod est erroneum dicere: "That saying hath no foundation or warrant in the words written by St. John. Therefore to speak of receiving of the sacrament, in true understanding, it hath no force of commandment, neither touching the clergy, nor touching the laity. For in the same course of words it is opened sufficiently, of what eating and drinking it ought*

Matthias
Doring, in
Psalm. cx.
[ap. Lyr. iii.
1300.]

Nothing
directly to
the sacra-
ment.

No proof
touching the
sacrament.

Could not be
spoken.

By way of
prognosti-
cation.

It were great
error.

to be taken : I mean" (not of the sacramental, but) "of the spiritual eating and drinking. For it followeth, 'He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him.' Which words St. Augustine expoundeth thus : 'This is the eating of that meat, and the drinking of that drink, for a man to dwell in Christ, and to have Christ dwelling in him :' which is nothing else, but to be in the love of Christ. But this pertaineth nothing directly to the sacramental or bodily eating. For this was spoken long before the sacrament was ordained. Therefore out of those words they can make no good proof, touching the communion of the sacrament. For first it is needful, that the thing, whereof we speak, have a present being. Therefore so heavenly a saying could not then be spoken of the receiving of the sacrament, for that at that time the sacrament as yet had no being : unless some curious heretic will say, that the said words in the sixth of John were spoken of the sacrament by way of prognostication, or by a prophecy. But that saying can have no foundation in any part of the scriptures. And therefore it is as easily despised, as it may be proved : forasmuch as it appeareth evidently by the gospel, that certain have satisfied this commandment," (and have eaten Christ's *flesh*, and drunken his *blood*,) "that certainly were never partakers of the sacrament. For that cause St. Augustine saith, 'These two sayings be both true, *He that eateth not, eateth* : and, *He that eateth, eateth not*.' Otherwise it would follow, that no man can be in the love of Christ, unless he be partaker of the sacrament : which thing to say, it were great error." Now, M. Harding, let your reader judge indifferently between us, touching this forgery. Matthias Doring saith : "Your saying hath no warrant of the scripture : " he saith, "These words" (in the sixth of John) "cannot directly pertain to the receiving of the sacrament," for that the sacrament at that time was not ordained : he saith, "You are a curious heretic," if you think these words were spoken by prognostication, or by prophecy : he saith, "We may as well despise your phantasy, as you can prove it : " he saith, "That to apply these words to the receiving of

the sacrament, it were great error." And for proof of his own judgment herein, he allegeth the authority of St. Augustine. I cannot see, in what kind of speech he could more clearly have expressed his meaning.

But you will say, "Matthias Doring spake not of the words that you allege:" which are these: "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath life everlasting, and I will raise him again at the last day:" but only and specially of these words, "Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, you shall have no life in you." "Of these words," you say, "Matthias Doring spake, and not of the other." What fond folly is this, M. Harding? why should you so vainly deceive the world? what difference find you between these two sentences? were they not both uttered in one chapter, in one place, at one time, by one mouth, and to one purpose? If the one part pertain to the sacrament, what hath the other offended, that it may not likewise pertain to the sacrament? what cause, what reason, what authority, have you to the contrary? If you have any, let it appear: otherwise your reader will think, you talk without ground, ye care not what. I protest before God, it pitieth me to see your follies.

Matthias Doring speaketh not only or specially of one or two words, as you say, but generally of all the words, that Christ spake in the sixth chapter of St. John, "Touching the eating of his flesh, and drinking of his blood:" which words, he saith, "pertain not directly to the receiving of the sacrament." And his reason is this: "For," saith he, "when Christ spake these words, the sacrament as yet was not ordained." I beseech you, doth not this reason include as well the one sentence as the other? when Christ spake these words, *Nisi ederitis carnem filii hominis*, &c.: "The sacrament," saith Matthias, "was not yet ordained." And was it suddenly ordained, before he could utter the next words following? The next words are these, that you have alleged, "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath life everlasting, and I shall raise him up at the last day." Neither these words nor the former pertain directly to the sacrament.

M. Harding,
fol. 375 a.

Michael.
Vehe, contra
Lutherum,
tract. 5.

As Matthias Doring saith, even so saith Michael Vehe, another of your own doctors : *Quam nihil firmitatis habeat hæc ratio, hinc claret, quod verbis Christi abutitur in peregrino sensu. Quæ enim de spirituali manducatione, &c. :*

In a strange
meaning.
Wresteth.

“How weak this reason is, it appeareth hereby, that he abuseth Christ’s words in a strange meaning. For the words, that were spoken of the spiritual eating, he wresteth to the eating of the sacrament : of which eating of the sacrament, Christ in these words in the sixth chapter of St. John speaketh nothing. Which thing is well proved by this reason : for many have spiritual life by the grace of God, and be lively members of Christ’s body, that were never partakers of the sacrament,” &c.

Christ spake
nothing of.

So likewise saith Eckius, speaking of the sixth chapter of St. John : *Ad sacramentum hic oculus non est habendus :* “In this chapter we may have no eye unto the sacrament⁴⁴.” I could allege mo of your own doctors to like purpose. But my head is weary of your wrangling. ¶

Eckius, de
Utraque
Specie. [tom.
iv. fol. xlii.
col. 4. ed.
1540.]

John vi. 53.

Christ saith further : “Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye shall have no life in you.” If there be none other eating of Christ’s body, whereby we shall live, but only your fantastical and fleshly eating with mouth and teeth, then I beseech you, what life have Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron, and other holy patriarchs and prophets, that were before the coming of Christ ? what life have a great number of holy martyrs ? what life have Christian children, that, being baptized in the blood of Christ, depart this life before they can receive the sacrament : that is to say, by your strange exposition, before they have *really* and *substantially* eaten the flesh of Christ ? will ye say, They have no life ? or will ye condemn them all to everlasting death ? or must we think, they shall never rise again ? Certainly St. Augustine saith precisely : *Qui manducat, habet vitam : et qui non manducat, non habet vitam :* “Whoso eateth” (the flesh of Christ) “hath life : and whoso eateth it not, hath no life.” Hereof we must needs conclude by your divinity, that Abraham,

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
26. [iii. pt. 2.
500.]

⁴⁴ [The Editor is uncertain, which he has assigned in the margin ; but the meaning is similar.]

Isaac, Jacob, Moses, and other godly fathers, that never received the sacrament, have no life, but are dead for ever, without hope of *resurrection*.

But, to leave your phantasies, M. Harding, the cause of our *resurrection*, as St. Paul saith, is the Spirit of God, that dwelleth in us. Origen saith : *Resurgemus propter Spiritum habitantem in nobis : necesse est enim Spiritui reddi habitaculum suum* : “ We shall rise again because of the Spirit, that dwelleth within us : for of necessity the Spirit must have his house restored unto him.” St. Augustine saith : *Hæc mea tota spes est, et omnis fiducia. Est enim in ipso Jesu Christo Domino nostro uniuscujusque nostrum portio, caro et sanguis. Ubi ergo portio mea regnat, ibi ego me regnare credo* : “ This is my whole hope, and all my trust. For in Christ Jesu our Lord is flesh and blood, which is a portion of each of us. Therefore where a portion of mine reigneth, there I believe that I reign too⁴⁵.”

St. Cyril saith : *Quamvis mors propter peccatum in naturam nostram insiliit, . . . tamen, quia Filius Dei homo factus est, omnes profecto resurgemus* : “ Although death be fallen into our nature because of sin, yet because the Son of God is made man, doubtless we shall all rise again⁴⁶.” Likewise again he saith : *Sic vos effeci participes divinæ naturæ, cum Spiritum meum fecerim habitare in vobis. Christus enim in nobis est per Spiritum, corruptionem nostram in incorruptionem commutans* : “ So I made you partakers of the divine nature, when I caused my Spirit to dwell in you. For Christ is in us by his Spirit, changing our corruption into incorruption⁴⁷.” Thus the Spirit of God is the cause and the worker of our *resurrection*. And, to come near unto you, the sacraments of Christ are also means, and instruments, and seals hereof, but not the

⁴⁵ [These Meditations are not by St. Augustine.]

⁴⁶ [S. Cyrill. in Johan. Διὰ τοῦτο κἀν βιάσθαι τὸ ἀνθρώπινον σῶμα πρὸς τὸ καταφθεῖσθαι δεῖν ὁ διὰ τῆς παραβάσεως ἐπιτηδήςας θάνατος, ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ Χριστὸς διὰ τῆς ἰδίας γίνεται σαρκὸς, ἀναστήσόμεθα πάντως.]

⁴⁷ [St Cyril. in Johan. . . . καθὸ ἐφύηνα μὲν ἄνθρωπος ἐγώ, κοινωνοὺς δὲ θείας φύσεως ἀπέδειξα, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐμὸν ἐνοικίσας ὑμῖν. ἐν ἡμῖν γάρ ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος, μετατρέπων εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν τὸ φθεῖσθαι πεφικὸς, καὶ μετατιθεῖς ἐκ τοῦ καταθνήσκειν πρὸς τὸ μὴ οὕτως ἔχον.]

Cyrrill. in
Johan. lib.
12. cap. 58.
[iv. 1104. E.]

causes. St. Cyril saith : *Quod mystica communio resurrectionis quædam sit confessio, verbis Christi ipsius probatur.....Ait enim, Hoc est corpus meum : Hoc in memoriam mei facite :* "That the mystical communion is a certain confession of the *resurrection*, it is proved by the words of Christ himself. For he saith, 'This is my body : 'Do this in remembrance of me'⁴⁸.'" And therefore in the council of Nice, the holy mysteries are called *resurrectionis nostræ symbola* : "the pledges or tokens of our *resurrection*"⁴⁹. And St. Ambrose⁵⁰, speaking distinctly hereof, saith : *Non iste panis, qui vadit in corpus, sed panis vitæ æternæ, qui animæ nostræ substantiam fulcit :* "It is not this bread" (of the sacrament) "that passeth into the body : but it is the bread of everlasting life," (that is to say, the very body of Christ itself) "that sustaineth the substance of our soul."

Concil. Ni-
cæn. [ii. 888.]

De Con. dist.
2. Non iste.

And, to put the matter further out of doubt, the same force unto *resurrection*, that is applied unto the sacrament of Christ's body, is also, and in as ample sort, given to the sacrament of baptism.

Basil. de
Sanct. Bap-
tismate. [ii.
114.]
τὸ δὲ βάπ-
τισμα δύνα-
μις ἐστὶ
πρὸς τὴν
ἀνάστασιν.

St. Basil saith : *Dies paschatis est pignus resurrectionis : baptisma vero est potentia et vis ad resurrectionem :* "Easter-day is a pledge of *resurrection* : but baptism is a power and strength unto *resurrection*."

Again he saith : *Resurrectionis gratiam in die resurrectionis excipiamus :* "Upon the day of Christ's *resurrection*, let us receive" (baptism, which is) "the grace of *resurrection*."

Ignatius ad
Trallien. [In-
terpol. Rus-
sel. ii. 154.]

Ignatius saith : *Ut credentes in mortem ejus, per baptismum participes ejus resurrectionis efficiamini :* "That believing in his death, by baptism ye may be made partakers of his *resurrection*." Therefore in the council of Worms it is written thus : *In aquas demersio, in infernum descensio est : et rursus, ab aquis emersio, resurrectio est :*

Concil.
Worm-
tæn. cap. 5.
[xv. 870 d.]

⁴⁸ [S. Cyril. in Johan. "Ὅτι γὰρ ἡ κοινωνία τῆς μυστικῆς εὐλογίας ὁμολογία τίς ἐστι τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ, σαφές ἂν γένοιτο, καὶ μαλὰ ῥαδίως, δι' ὃν αὐτὸς ἔφη, τὸν τοῦ μυστηρίου τύπον ἐπιτελέσας δι'

ἐαυτοῦ· διακλάσας γὰρ, κ. τ. λ.]

⁴⁹ [Supra vol. ii. p. 358, note ⁵³.]

⁵⁰ [See Richter's ed. of the Decretum. This passage was erroneously attributed by Gratian to St. Ambrose. It is from Ivo.]

“ The dipping into the water, is the going down into hell :
and the coming out from the water, is the resurrection.”

In the end, M. Harding, ye blow up merrily your own conquest, and thus ye say : “ We have confuted the doctrine, wherein ye declare your faith ; and the chief grounds, whereon ye build your new gospel, we have disproved :” but with so simple proofs, and so many untruths, M. Harding, as, for honour’s sake, may not well be shewed in your triumph.

Here endeth the Second Part.

THE THIRD PART.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 1. Divis. 1.*

BEHOLD, these are the horrible heresies, for the ^[Vol. iv. p. 28.] which a good part of the world is at this day condemned by the bishop of Rome: and yet were never heard to plead their cause. He should have commenced his suit rather against Christ, against the apostles, and against the holy fathers. For these things did not only proceed from them, but were also appointed by them: except perhaps these men will say, (as I think they will indeed,) that Christ never instituted the *holy communion*, to be divided amongst the faithful: or that Christ's apostles and the ancient fathers said *private masses*, in every corner of the temples, now ten, now twenty together in one day: or that Christ and his apostles banished all the common people from the *sacrament of his blood*: or that the thing, that they themselves do at this day everywhere, and do it so, as they condemn him for an heretic which doth otherwise, is not called of Gelasius, their own doctor, plain *sacrilege*: or that these be not the very words⁵¹ of Ambrose, Augustine, Gelasius, Theodoret, Chrysostom

⁵¹ [The passages follow in the same order, as that in which their respective authors are named.]

and Origen: "The bread and wine in the sacraments remain still the same they were before:" "The thing, which is seen upon the holy table, is bread:" "There ceaseth not to be still the substance of bread, and nature of wine:" "The substance and nature of bread is not changed:" "The selfsame bread, as touching the material substance, goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the privy:" or that Christ, the apostles, and holy fathers prayed not in that tongue which the people might understand: or that Christ hath not performed all things by that one offering which he once offered upon the cross: or that the same sacrifice was unperfect, so that now we have need of another.

M. HARDING.

.....⁵² What crake ye of a good part of the world? The greater is the number of those ye have seduced, the more grievous shall be your judgment. There be not yet many years past, that ye boasted of your poor small flock, alluding to the fewness of flock, that lived with Christ in flesh, and made their fewness an argument of the sincere truth. But now that through your evil teaching ^a the world groweth more to be dissolute and wicked, ye boast of your number.....⁵³ This is certain, touching grounds of truth, the church erreth not, as that which enjoyeth Christ's promise: and your congregation, teaching the contrary, must therefore be taken for the children of the father of lies..... Though ten or twenty masses were not said in one day by Christ, the apostles, or fathers, as ye scoff, when the faith was first preached, ^b and few believed, no churches (which here, not without profane malice, ye name temples) yet being built: this is no sufficient reason, why we may not now, where the faith is generally received, have sundry masses in one church in one day. Ye make much ado about both kinds, and to aggravate the matter, ye use the odious term of banishing the people from the cup. We teach the people for ^c good causes to be content with one kind, doing them to understand, they receive the whole body of ^d Christ, flesh and blood, no less than if they received both kinds..... The sacrilege which Gelasius speaketh of, consisteth

^a Whoso wanteth dissolution and wickedness, may seek it at Rome.

^b Untruth. For in the time of Augustine, Ambrose, Hierom, &c. there were no Christians in the world, than be at this present.

^c Good causes against God. ^d One dream to prove another.

⁵² [Harding says that, having now confuted the chief points of the defender's doctrine, he will be so short as the matters will con-

veniently bear, &c.]

⁵³ [Here is a long digression about the council of Trent.]

e Untruth.
For it stood
in dividing of
the sacrament.

f Howsoever
Christ and
his apostles
did, the pope
and his clergy
cannot do
amiss.

g Untruth,
plain and
sensible. For
this order
was not from
the begin-
ning.

e in dividing Christ, and the same he imputeth to the Manichees, as I have another where declared. And therefore as that toucheth not us, who do not divide Christ, but in the sacrament give to the people whole Christ, so it sheweth you to be either slanderous or ignorant.....

To M. Jew-
el's chal-
lenge, art. 2.

As for the tongue of the church service, f howsoever Christ, the apostles and holy fathers prayed, the use of the Latin tongue, used in the service of the Latin church, is not by any reason or authority ye can bring yet, so far disproved, that the church ought to condemn the order g from the beginning received, and hitherto continued.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

We make no crakes of our numbers, M. Harding, but humbly give God thanks, that, maugre all your practices and policies, hath published and proclaimed the name of his Son in every place through the world. The forth and force thereof grieveth you now, as it did others your fathers before you, that cried out in an agony: "What shall we do? All the world runneth after him." Of them St. Cyril saith: *Quicquid Christo credentium accesserit, sibi detractum putant*: "As many faithful believers as are gotten to Christ, so many they think are lost from themselves⁵³."

John xii. 19.

Cyrill. in
Johan. lib. 8.
cap. 1. [ed.
1573. p. 867.]

Notwithstanding, the truth of God hangeth neither of many, nor of few. Liberius, the bishop of Rome, said sometime to the Arian emperor Constantius: *Non, si ego solus sum, idcirco minor est ratio fidei*: "Although I be alone, yet the account of faith is therefore no whit the less." Christ compareth the kingdom of God unto a piece of leaven, which being little in quantity the woman taketh, and layeth in a great lump of dough, until the whole be all leavened.

Theod. lib. 21
cap. 16. [ed.
Reading. 1.
p. 94.]
οὐ διὰ τὸ
εἶναι μὲν
μόνον, δὲ
τῆς πίστεως
ἐλαττοῦται
λόγος.

Matt. xiii. 33.

Chrysost. in
Matt. hom.
47. [vii. 484.]

Chrysostom saith: *Nemo paucitatem vestram deploret. Magna enim est virtus prædicationis. Et quod semel fermentatum est, rursus fermentum ad cætera efficitur*: "Let no man bewail the small number of you. For great is the virtue of preaching. And whoso is once leavened, is himself made leaven to leaven others."

In Proæmio
Clement.
in Gloss. [a.
col. 2.]

It is noted in the Gloss upon the Clementines: *Veritas pedetentim cognoscitur*: "Truth is known by little and by little." And St. Ambrose: *Constat diluvium eodem numero,*

⁵³ [Supra vol. v. p. 217, note 35.]

quo cumulatum est, esse diminutum: "It is known, that the flood in the time of Noe, as it grew by degrees, so by degrees it abated." Origen saith: *Ego concitabo eos in non gentem. Nos sumus non gens, qui pauci ex ista civitate credimus, et alii ex alia. Et nusquam gens integra ab initio credulitatis videtur assumpta*: "I shall provoke them by them that are no people. We are they, that were no people, that believe in Christ, a few in this city, and a few in another. And never was there any nation, that was taken whole at the first beginning of the faith." The meaning hereof is this, that God calleth men, not all together, but now a few, now mo, as unto his secret wisdom seemeth best. So is it written in the late council of Basil: *Spiritus Sanctus non illuminat omnes eodem tempore: sed ubi vult, et quando vult, spirat*: "The Holy Ghost doth not give light to all men at one time: but breatheth where it will, and when it will."

Ambros. de Noe et Arca, cap. 17. [l. 253.]
Origen. In Psal. xxxvi. hom. t. [ii. 655. col. 2.]

In Concil. Basil. in Epist. Synodali. p. 152.
[Concill. Crabb. tom. iii.]

This is the counsel and the hand of God, M. Harding. We may say unto you, as Tertullian said sometime unto the heathens:..... *Exquisitior quæque crudelitas vestra, illecebra est magis sectæ: plures efficitur, quoties metimur a vobis. Semen est sanguis Christianorum*: "Your earnest cruelty is an enticement and a provocation unto this sect: as often as ye reckon us⁵⁴, ye find us mo and mo. The seed hereof is Christian blood." Arnobius said sometime unto the enemies of the cross of Christ: *Nonne hæc saltem fidem vobis faciunt argumenta credendi, quod jam per omnes terras, in tam brevi tempore et parvo, immensa nominis hujus sacramenta diffusa sunt?* "At the least, do not these proofs make you believe, that ye see the great secrets of this name" (of Christ) "are poured abroad in so short space through all countries?"

Tertull. in Apologet. [sub finem p. 40.]

Arnobius adver. Gent. lib. i. [leg. lib. 2.]

Fight not against God, M. Harding. "There is no wisdom, there is no counsel against the Lord." Prov. xxi. 30.

"This is certain," ye say, "touching the grounds of faith, the church erreth not." Whether your church have erred or no, and in what grounds it hath erred, it shall better appear hereafter. Truly St. Bernard saith of your

⁵⁴ [Rather, "as often as we are cut down."]

Bernard, ad
Clerum, in
Concil. Rhe-
men. [Mansi
xxi. 471.]
Bernard, in
Cantica,
hom. 33. [iv.
1397.]

church, even of your church of Rome: *Intestina, et insana-
bilis facta est plaga ecclesiae*: "The wound of the church
is within the bowels, and past recovery." And again:
*Hæc sunt infelicissima tempora, quæ prævidit apostolus, in
quibus homines sanam doctrinam non sustinent*: "These be
the unhappy days that the apostle saw before, when men
cannot abide sound doctrine⁵⁴." This was St. Bernard's
judgment of *your church, that it would hear no sound doc-
trine*: and that it for that cause seemed *utterly past re-
covery*. Therefore so certainly to assure yourself of a thing
uncertain, it was no wisdom. We may say of your *popes*
and *bishops*, whom only ye mean by the name of *your*
church, as St. Hierom said sometime of certain others your
fathers long ago:.....*Non tam indignantur nobis hæc expo-
nentibus, et prophetis vaticinantibus, quam Dominum depre-
centur, et studiose agant, ne de sacerdotibus, qui violant
sancta Domini, esse mereantur*: "Let them not take
stomach against us that expound these things, nor against
the prophets that foretold these things: but let them pray
unto God, and take good heed, that they be not of those
priests, that defile the holy things of the Lord."

Hieronym.
in Sophon.
cap. 3. [iii.
1673.]

Psal. x. 4.

1 Cor. iii. 16.

2 Cor. vi. 16.

Chrysost. in
Matt. hom.
38, in Opere
Imperf. [vi.
app. 159.]

"Churches," ye say, "not without profane malice, ye
call temples." Malice come unto him, M. Harding, that
malice meaneth. The prophet David saith: "*The Lord*
in his holy temple:" St. Paul saith: "Your bodies be the
temples of the Holy Ghost: know ye not that ye be the
temple of God: if any man defile the *temple* of God,
the Lord will destroy him: ye are the *temple* of the
living God." "What agreement is there between the
temple of God, and an idol?" So many times St. Paul
nameth *temples* together in one place: and yet, I think,
without any great *profane malice*. But it shall be lawful
for you, M. Harding, to make new sins, and to say, The
apostles of Christ were malicious and wicked, only for that
they called the *church* of God by the name of *temple*.
Would God ye had not turned God's *temple* into the *syna-
gogue* of Satan. We see by your practice, it is true, that
St. Chrysostom saith: *Sicut de templo omne bonum egre-*

⁵⁴ [The reference in the ed. of but the Editor has not discovered
1570 is to Serm. Salve Regina; this passage.]

ditur, ita etiam de templo omne malum procedit: "As every good thing proceedeth from the *temple*, so every ill thing proceedeth likewise from the *temple*."

In defence of your *half communion*, ye say, "for good causes ye teach the people to be content with one kind." And thus ye force the poor people contrary to the express word of Christ, contrary to the example of the apostles, and all the holy fathers in the primitive church, and contrary to the general use and order of a whole thousand years, to give ear to your *good causes*. But *these causes*, no doubt, are great and worthy: otherwise ye would not weigh them against God. But wherefore are they dissembled? why are they not told us? Your own doctors, Alphonsus de Castro and John Gerson, have laid them out in this wise particularly and at large: "The danger of shedding:" "the carrying from place to place:" "the fouling of the cups:" "the trouble of men's beards:" "the reserving for the sick:" "the turning the wine into vinegar:" "the engendering of flies:" "the corruption or putrefaction:" "the loathsomeness that may happen for so many to drink of one cup:" "the impossibility of providing one cup, that may be sufficient to serve all the people:" "in some places wine is dear:" "in some places the wine will be *frore*⁵⁵."

Alphon. ad-
versus Hæ-
res. lib. 6.
De Eucha-
rist. Section.
ultima. [p.
442.]
Johan. Ger-
son, de com-
munionē
laicor. [l.
528 d.]

These, M. Harding, be the fairest and greatest of your *good causes*. And yet have you thus concluded in your late chapter at Trident: *Si quis dixerit, Sanctam ecclesiam catholicam non justis causis, et rationibus adductam fuisse, ut laicos, atque etiam clericos non conficientes, sub panis tantummodo specie communicaret, aut in eo errasse, anathema sit*: "If any man shall say, that the holy catholic church, without *just causes and reasons* her moving, doth communicate both the laity, and also priests, unless they minister, under the only form of bread, or that the church hath erred in the same, accursed be he." Therefore Tertullian saith rightly of you: *Credunt* [Pr. leg. *credant*] *sine scripturis, ut credant contra scripturas*: "They believe *without the scriptures*, that they may believe *against the scriptures*."

Concil. Tri-
dent. de
Commun.
sub una
specie, cap.
2. [Hard. x.
121.]

Tertull. de
Prescriptio-
nib. [cap. 23.
p. 210.]

⁵⁵ [Frore=frozen.]

Hieronym.
in Sophon.
cap. i. [iii.
1653.]

But specially, I beseech you, M. Harding, consider well these words of St. Hierom, and see, whether ye may apply them to yourselves, or no: *In consummatione mundi. ... scrutabitur Dominus Hierusalem, id est, ecclesiam suam cum lucerna, et ulciscetur super viros contemptores, qui noluerunt servare custodias suas, id est, mandata Domini contempserunt: et insuper ratione se peccare dicentes, blasphemaverunt in cordibus suis:* "In the end of the world our Lord shall search Hierusalem, that is to say, his church with a candle, and shall wreak himself upon the despisers, that would not keep their watches, that is to say, that despised the commandments of God: and over and besides this, saying, they had *good causes and reasons, wherefore they should offend*" (and break God's commandments), "*they blasphemed in their hearts.*"

De Con. dist.
2. Compe-
rimus.

1 Cor. viii. 6.
Evagr. lib.
cap. 17. [leg.
lib. 2. cap.
18. tom. iii.
312.]
Concil. Chal-
cedon. act. 2.
[Mansi vi.
960.]
Ἀνάθεμα
τῷ μερίζον-
τι: ἀνάθεμα
τῷ διαίρου-
ντι.

That ye surmise of Gelasius is most untrue. He speaketh not one word there of the *dividing of Christ* as you imagine: nor had he any cause so to speak. But he saith in most plain wise, "*It is sacrilege to do the same thing that you do,*" that is to say, to divide the sacrament, and to minister the one part, as ye do, without the other. Look better on your books: and confess the truth, as ye shall find it. The words be these: *Aut integra sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur. Quia divisio unius ejusdemque mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest pervenire:* "Either let them receive the *whole sacraments*, or else let them be driven *from the whole*. For the division of one and the same mystery" (or sacrament) "*cannot happen without great sacrilege.*" He speaketh not of the division of *one Christ*, as you tell us, but of the division of *one mystery*.

Otherwise, touching Christ, we say with St. Paul: *Unus Dominus Jesus Christus:* "There is one Lord Jesus Christ." And we protest with the bishops of the east in the council of Chalcedon: "*Accursed be he, that parteth Christ: accursed be he, that divideth him*"⁵⁴."

⁵⁴ [The Greek words in the margin are from Evagrius, reported by him as used in a former council (2nd of Ephesus); and

they look as if they were used in approbation of the heresy of Eutyches. In the Concil. Chalced. (ap. Mansi vi. 960), the Latin transla-

That you say, "The order of your Latin service hath evermore been used in the Latin church from the beginning:" it is utterly untrue. For proof whereof, I remit you to my former Reply in the third Article, and the fifteenth division. [Supra vol. ii. p. 45.]

The rest that ye allege is not worth the answering.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 1. Divis. 2.

[Vol. iv. p. 28.]

All these things must they of necessity say, unless perchance they had rather say thus, That *all law and right is locked up in the treasury of the pope's breast*, and that, as once one of his soothing pages and clawbacks did not stick to say, the "pope is able to dispense against the apostles," against a "council," and against the "canons" and rules of the "apostles:" and that he is not bound to stand, neither to the examples, nor to the ordinances, nor to the laws of Christ. [Dist. 35. Lector. in Glossa.]

[Dist. 82. Presbyt.]

M. HARDING.

To say that all law and right (your Latin term is *fas*) is locked up in the treasury of the pope's breast, it were absurd and unreasonable. Marry to say that the laws rest in the pope's breast, after a certain meaning, as hereafter shall be declared, it is a not altogether beside truth and reason. But, sirs, what if some mean writer or glosser upon the canon law speak somewhere out of square, if all should be exactly tried by scripture, will ye lay that to our charge? shall the faith of the catholic church thereby be called in doubt and question? We take not upon us to defend all that the canonists or schoolmen say or write, &c. In this kind or order be many things, which may rather be called rules of manners, than principles, or such as we term *axiomata*, of our faith. These, although they be found written in the scripture, forasmuch as they have been commanded by an occasion, and for some cause, they may for cause, and occasion, and, as we find in C. *Lector*, for necessity, by God's deputy and vicar be supplied, holpen, expounded. And, if the case so require, he in the same, for a certain cause, with a certain person, for a certain

a Not altogether beside truth: a cold defence.

It is no reason, that divines be required to make good whatsoever is written by the canonists or schoolmen.

tion agrees with the Greek given in the margin by Jewel, but the Greek is ἀνάθεμα τῷ μερίζοντι, καὶ τῷ συγχέοντι: and so writes Evangelius, p. 321.]

time, with certain circumstances, may dispense by the same Spirit they were first founded and instituted withal, and with the same intention, to wit, for some special good and furtherance of godliness.....Such administration of God's law, and such dispensation thereof, as of a precious treasure, not free, or at liberty and pleasure, but an even, just, and good dispensation, they do attribute to God's vicar, whom this defender calleth the pope's parasites, pages, and clawbacks, himself a very page, slave, and clawback to the devil.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here, M. Harding, ye roam and wander, and go masked, as a man that were benighted, and had lost his way. "In some cases," ye say, "the pope may dispense against God's word: in some cases he may not." Fain would ye, for shame, somewhat limit and restrain his immoderate authority: but ye know not, where to lay the bounds. Ye make small account of your *school doctors* and *canonists*, that is to say, of the *principal pillars* of your catholic church: and think them not worthy to be your guides. Howbeit, your labour cannot all be lost: for they will think as light of you.

But forasmuch as ye say, "They flatter not the pope, nor be his pages, or parasites:" but speak roundly to him, and tell him his own, it shall not be much amiss, to hearken a little, what they say.

One of them saith thus: ^a *Papa potest dispensare contra jus naturale*: "The pope may dispense against the *law of nature*." Another saith: ^b *Papa dispensat contra canones apostolorum*: "The pope dispenseth against the *canons or rules of the apostles*." Another saith: ^c *Papa potest mutare formam verborum in baptismo*: "The pope may change the *form of words in baptism*." Another saith: ^d *Privilegium dari potest contra jus Divinum*: "The pope's privilege may be granted against the *law of God*." Another saith: ^e *Papa ex maxima causa potest dispensare contra Novum Testamentum*: "The pope, upon a very great cause, may dispense against the *New Testament*." Another saith: ^f *Papa potest dispensare de omnibus præceptis Veteris et Novi Testamenti*: "The pope may dispense for *any com-*

a 15. quæst.
6. Authoritat.
In Glossa.

b Dist. 82.
Presbyter.

c Fellin, de
Constitutio.
cap. Statuta
Canonum,
col. 6. [Quæ
in ecclesiam.
fol. 25.]

d 16. quæst.
1. Quicun-
que. In
Glossa.

e Panor.
Extra, de
Divortis,
cap. fin.
[in lib. 4.
Extra, tom.
iii. fol. 54.
col. 1.]

f Summa
Angel. in
Dictione
papa. [No. 1.]

mandment of the Old or New Testament⁵⁵." Another saith: ^g *Papa potest dispensare contra Epistolas Pauli*: ^g *Fellin. de Constitutio. cap. Statuta Canonum. [Quæ in eccl. fol. 25.]* "The pope may dispense against the *Epistles of St. Paul*." And, somewhat to qualify the outrage of the matter, another saith: ^h *Papa potest dispensare contra jus Divinum in particulari, non in universali*: ^h *Fellin. de Majoritate et Obedient. cap. 2.* "The pope may dispense against the *law of God in particular, not in general*." And again: ⁱ *Papa potest tollere jus Divinum ex parte, non in totum*: ⁱ *Idem de Majoritate et Obedient. cap. fin.* "The pope may *abolish the law of God in part, but not in whole*." Another saith: ^k *Martinus papa Quintus dispensavit cum quodam, qui acceperat germanam suam in uxorem*: ^k *Summa Angel. in Dictione pap. [fol. 225. col. 3. No. 1.]* "Pope Martin the Fifth dispensed with a man, that had *taken to wife his own sister*⁵⁶." Whether this report be true or false, I refer myself to the credit of the author. Verily, that the *natural brother* should marry his own *natural sister*, it would need a good strong dispensation: for God himself hath by most express words commanded the contrary. Another saith: ^l *Papa potest dispensare cum omnibus personis, nisi cum patre et matre*: ^l *Panor. Extra, de Electione et Electi potest. Venerabilem.* "The pope may dispense *with all persons*" (touching marriage) "*saving only with father and mother*" (to marry, or to be married to their children). Another saith: ^m *Papa potest supra jus dispensare: et de injustitia potest facere justitiam: et sententiam, quæ nulla est, facere aliquam: et de nihilo, facere aliquid*: ^m *De Translatione Episcop. Quanto.* "The pope may dispense *above the law*: the pope of *wrong, may make right*: the pope of *no sentence, may make a sentence*: the pope of *nothing, may make something*." The cause hereof, as another saith, is this: ⁿ *Quia papa potest, excepto peccato, quasi omnia facere, quæ potest Deus*: ⁿ *Hostien. de Translatione Episcop. Quanto.* "Sin only excepted, the pope may do in a manner, *whatsoever God may do*."

Another saith: ^o *Papa habet auctoritatem declarandi scripturas, ita ut non liceat oppositum tenere, vel opinari*: ^o *Hervæus de potestate papæ.*

⁵⁵ [Sum. Angel. This assertion is limited by a qualifying clause to certain cases "in quibus deficeret ratio legis." It is said at first in reference to the second table; and then Clavasio adds, "et quod dico de præceptis secundæ ta-

bulæ, idem dico de omnibus præceptis Veteris et Novi Testamenti."]

⁵⁶ [Summa Angelica. The authority given for this statement is Archidiaconus Florentinus.]

"The pope hath authority so to expound and to declare the scriptures, that it may not be lawful for any man to hold, or to think the contrary." For cardinalis Cusanus saith, as it is said before: *p Scripturæ ad tempus adaptatæ sunt, et varie intellectæ, ita ut uno tempore secundum currentem universalem ritum exponantur: mutato ritu, iterum sententia mutetur*: "The scriptures are applied unto the time, and are diversly understood: so that at one time they are taken according to the universal current order: which order being changed, the meaning of the scriptures is changed too."

p Cardinal Cusan. ad Bohemos, epist. 2. [p. 833.]

q Francisc. de Maron. in 4. dist. 10. quest. 1. art. 2.

Another demandeth a question: *q Utrum papa ex plenitudine potestatis possit omnia?* "Whether the pope by the fulness of his power may do *all things?*"

r 9. quest. 3. Nemo: in Glossa.

Another saith: *r Si totus mundus sententiet contra papam, videtur quod standum esset sententiæ papæ*: "If all the world would give sentence contrary to the pope, yet it seemeth we ought to stand to the sentence of the pope." These, M. Harding, by your judgment, are *neither pages, nor parasites*: but good, sad, and earnest friends: such as love roughly and plainly to utter their mind without flattery.

Dan. vii. 8.

This doubtless is it, that Daniel so long before prophesied of him: *Dabitur illi os loquens grandia*: "He shall have a mouth given him, uttering great and presumptuous matters." For indeed, notwithstanding all this glorious glittering of painted authority, yet one of the pope's own men saith: *Papa non potest facere de quadrato rotundum*: "The pope" (notwithstanding his privileges, and all his power) "cannot make a square thing round⁵⁷." St. Bernard saith: *An regula non concordat cum evangelio, vel apostolo? Alioqui regula jam non est regula: quia non est recta*: "Doth not the rule agree with the gospel, or with the apostle? Otherwise that rule is no rule at all: for it is crooked: it is not straight."

And therefore pope Zosimus in more sober wise saith

Johan. Andreas de Judiciis. Cum venissent.

Bernard. in Apologia ad Guiliel. Abbatem. [ii. 537.]

⁵⁷ [Johan. Andr. does not exactly say this; "Hostiensis fatetur quod quamdiu papa vivit, dominus dicitur, et potest mutare

"quadrata rotundis . . . tamen vere loquendo nec ipse nec alius prælatus est dominus," vol. ii. Comm. in 2^{dum} Decretal.]

thus : *Contra statuta patrum condere aliquid, vel mutare, ne* Inter De-creta Zosimi.
hujus quidem sedis autoritas potest : “The authority of this see cannot order or change any thing, contrary to the orders of our fathers.”

Isidorus saith : *Is qui præest, si præter voluntatem, vel* 11. quæst. 3. Si is qui.
præter quod in scripturis sanctis evidenter præcipitur, vel dicit aliquid, vel imperat, tanquam falsus testis Dei, et sacrilegus habeatur : “He that is in authority, if he speak or command any thing, besides the will or meaning of God’s word, or otherwise than is expressly commanded in the scriptures, let him be taken as a *church-robber, and as a false witness against God.*”

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 1. Divis. 3.

[Vol. iv. p. 28.]

We, for our part, have learned these things of Christ, of the apostles, of the devout fathers : and do sincerely with good faith teach the people of God the same. Which thing is the only cause why we at this day are called heretics of the *chief prelate* (no doubt) of religion. O immortal God ! hath Christ himself then, the apostles, and so many fathers all at once gone astray ? were then Origen, Ambrose, Augustine, Chrysostom, Gelasius, Theodoretus, forsakers of the catholic faith ? was so notable a consent of so many ancient bishops and learned men, nothing else but a conspiracy of heretics ? or is that now condemned in us, which was then commended in them ? or is the thing now, by alteration only of one man’s⁵⁸ affections, suddenly become schismatic, which in them was counted catholic ? or shall that, which in times past was undoubtedly true, now by and by, because it liketh not these men, be judged false ? Let them then bring forth another gospel, and let them shew the causes, why these things,

⁵⁸ [Ed. Lat. “hominum.”]

which so long have openly been observed, and well allowed in the church of God, ought now in the end to be called in again. We know well enough, that the same word, which was opened by Christ, and spread abroad by the apostles, is sufficient, both to our salvation, and also to uphold and maintain all truth, and to confound all manner of heresy. By that word only do we condemn all sorts of the *old heretics*, whom these men say we have called out of hell again. As for the Arians, the Eutychians, the Marcionites, the Ebionites, the Valentinians, the Carpocratians, the Tatians, the Novatians, and shortly, all them, which have a wicked opinion, either of *God the Father*, or of *Christ*, or of the *Holy Ghost*, or of any other point of Christian religion, for so much as they be confuted by the gospel of Christ, we plainly pronounce them for detestable and damned persons, and defy them even unto the devil. Neither do we leave them so, but we also severely and straitly hold them in by lawful and politic punishments, if they fortune to break out any where, and bewray themselves.

M. HARDING.

We for our part know, as now we have proved, that ye have not learned these things of Christ, nor of the apostles, nor of the fathers: but of Luther, Zwinglius, Ecolampadius, Calvin, Peter Martyr, Bucer, and such other apostates: and that ye do most falsely and wickedly lead the people into the pit with you. And therefore ye are justly condemned by the church, and deemed heretics, &c.

How condemn ye the Donatists, seeing with them ye break and throw down the holy altars of God, on which (as Optatus writeth) the body and blood of Christ was wont to be laid? &c.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Hereto, M. Harding, the whole gross sum of your answer in effect is this: "Ye falsely and wickedly lead the people

ye are apostates: ye are heretics: ye are impudent and rebellious children: ye are despisers of God: mockers of your mother: and perverters of the apostles: ye utter lies: ye speak blasphemies." At the last ye say, "The devil dwelleth in our hearts, as in his shop." This is a hasty kind of logic, M. Harding. He must needs be hard-hearted, that will not yield to such arguments.

To leave other your waste words, of Vigilantius, Jovinian, Manichee, Acrius, and such others, in the end ye pronounce your *definitive sentence*, as a judge, and condemn us for heretics, for that we have taken down your shops and gainful booths, which ye call the *holy altars of God*. Verily this must needs be thought either extreme rigour, or great folly, of the removing of a stone to make an heresy. Such heresies, I trow, St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, Optatus, and other learned fathers knew but few.

Neither is there any good sufficient reason to be shewed, wherefore it should more be heresy in us to take down your needless and superstitious walls, which ye had erected of yourselves, without commission, than it was lately in you, to tear in sunder, and to burn our communion tables: in the erection and use whereof we had the undoubted example, both of Christ himself, and also of the ancient catholic fathers. I say nothing of your cruelty in burning so many Bibles, and books of God's holy word: so many of your brethren's bodies: so many temples of the Holy Ghost.

As for the *altars*, which Optatus saith the Donatists brake down, they were certainly *tables of wood*, such as we have, and not *heaps of stones*, such as ye have: as in my former Reply made unto you it may better appear. St. Augustine, reporting the same story, saith: "The Donatists in their fury brake down the altar boards." His words be these: *Lignis ejusdem altaris effractis*. Likewise saith Athanasius of the like fury of the Arians: *Subsellia, thronum, mensam ligneam, et tabulas ecclesie, et cetera quae poterant, foras elata, combusserunt*: "They carried forth and burnt the seats, the pulpit, the wooden board, the church tables, and such other things as they could get."

Touching your *stone altars*, Beatus Rhenanus saith: *In*

Art. 3. divis.
26. [Supra
vol. ii. p. 83.]
Augustin.
epist. 50. ad
Bonifacium.
[ii. 654.]

Athanas. in
Epist. ad
solitariam
vitam a-
gentes. [i.
378.]

B. Rhen. in
Epistola
priefixa La-
turgie Chry-
sostom.

nostris basilicis ararum superaddititia structura novitatem præ se fert: "In our churches the *building up of altars, added to the rest, declareth a novelty*⁵⁹." This learned man telleth you, M. Harding, that your *stone altars* are but newly brought into the church of God: and that our *communion tables* are old and ancient, and have been used from the beginning.

We have such *altars*, M. Harding, as Christ, his apostles, St. Augustine, Optatus, and other catholic and holy fathers had and used, whose examples to follow we never thought it to be such heresy.

But Optatus saith: "The body and blood of Christ was wont to be laid *upon the altar*:" and with these words ye would fain astonne your simple reader, as if Christ's body lay there really, fleshly, verily, and indeed. But ye should remember, that St. Augustine saith: *Sacramentum corporis Christi secundum quendam modum corpus Christi est: et sacramentum sanguinis Christi secundum quendam modum sanguis Christi est*: "The sacrament of Christ's body" (not verily and indeed, but) "*after a certain manner of speech is Christ's body*: and the sacrament of Christ's blood *after a certain manner of speech is the blood of Christ*." This manner of speech your own Gloss thus expoundeth: *Vocatur corpus Christi, id est, significat corpus Christi*: "It is called the body of Christ, that is to say, *it signifieth the body of Christ*." And as Optatus saith: "Christ's body and blood were laid upon the *altar*, or communion table:" even so St. Augustine saith: "The whole people was in the communion cup, and laid upon the holy *table*." These be his words: *Vos estis in mensa: vos estis in calice*: "*You are upon the table: you are in the cup*." As the people is *upon the table*, so is Christ's body *upon the table*. The people is not laid there verily and indeed, but only in a mystery: even so the body of Christ, as Optatus saith, is laid there, not verily and indeed, nor in real and fleshly presence, but in a mystery.

Augustin. ad
Bonifac.
epist. 23. [ii.
207.]

De Con. dist.
2. Hoc est,
quod: in
Glossa.

Augustin. ad
Infantes.
Citatur a
Beda in
1 Cor. x.

⁵⁹ [Beatus Rhenanus is expressing his doubts as to the early practice of private mass. The preface will be found in *Missa Latina Antiqua* 1557, Bodl.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 2. Divis. 1.

[Vol. iv. p.
29.]

Indeed we grant, that certain new and very strange sects, as the Anabaptists, Libertines, Mennonians, and Zuenckfeldians, have been stirring in the world ever sithence the gospel did first spring. But the world seeth now right well, thanks be given to our God, that we have neither bred, nor taught, nor kept up these monsters. In good fellowship, I pray thee, whosoever thou be, read our books: they are to be sold in every place. What hath there ever been written by any of our company, that might plainly bear with the madness of any of those heretics? Nay, I say unto you, there is no country this day so free from their pestilent infections, as these be, wherein the gospel of Christ is freely and commonly preached. So that, if they weigh the very matter with earnest and upright advisement, this thing is a great argument of our part, that this same doctrine, which we teach, is the very truth of the gospel of Christ. For lightly neither is cockle wont to grow without the wheat, nor yet the chaff without the corn. For from the very apostles' times, who knoweth not, how many heresies did rise up even together, so soon as the gospel was first spread abroad? who ever heard tell of Simon, Menander, Saturninus, Basilides, Carpocrates, Cerinthus, Ebion, Valentinus, Secundus, Marcosius, Colorbasius, Heracleo, Lucianus, Severus, and other like, before the apostles were sent abroad? But why stand we reckoning up these? Epiphanius rehearseth up fourscore sundry heresies: and Augustine many mo, which sprang up even together with the *gospel*. What then? was the *gospel* there? were not the *gospel*, because heresies sprang up withal?

or was *Christ* therefore not *Christ*? (or was Christ and his gospel the cause of these heresies⁶⁰?)

And yet, as we said, doth not this great crop and heap of heresies grow up amongst us, which do openly, abroad, and frankly teach the gospel. These poisons take their beginnings, their increasings, and strength amongst our adversaries, in blindness, and in darkness, amongst whom truth is with tyranny and cruelty kept under, and cannot be heard, but in corners, and secret meetings. But let them make a proof: let them give the gospel free passage: let the truth of Jesus Christ give her clear light, and stretch forth her bright beams into all parts: and then shall they forthwith see, how all these shadows straight will vanish, and pass away at the light of the gospel, even as the thick mist of the night consumeth at the sight of the sun. For, whilst these men sit still, and make merry, and do nothing⁶¹, we continually repress and put back all those heresies, which they falsely charge us to nourish and maintain.

M. HARDING.

.....As for Libertines, what other substance hath your gospel, besides carnal liberty, and licentious living? To break the vow of chastity, solemnly made to God, by whose grace, and your endeavour, it might well have been kept, and to break it for wantonness, and to satisfy lust: is not that proper to Libertines? to give over fasting, watching in prayer, and confession of sins, which should be made to a priest, by ^a whom only (except in case of necessity) God promised forgiveness: to regard no tradition, though it came from the apostles: briefly, to teach that all kind of outward godliness is superstitious and pharisaical, and that every man must without staggering or doubting, believe that himself shall be saved, if he have faith, ^b do he what him li

Libertines.
The doctrine
of the liber-
tines' gospel.

n Most vain
untruth.
See the an-
swer.

b Untruth,
joined with
vile slander.

is this no point of liberty? What made so many malapert pr

⁶⁰ [There is nothing in the Latin to correspond with the sentence between brackets.] ⁶¹ [Lat. "illis interim s
bus atque aliud agentib"

tices, pleasant courtiers, discoursing parliament Machiavelists, and all other whatsoever flesh-worms, merchants, idle artificers, to embrace your gospel, rather than the graver and devouter sort of men, which be weaned from the pleasure of this life: but that it was plausible to the world, and pleasant to the flesh, from which that kind of men are most hardly drawn? And yet forsooth do not ye foster up libertines.....

Bemeland,
Silesia,
Moravia.

Who can reckon the sects that be in Germany, being ^csixteen ^cFour great untruths all together. or mo professed in some one town? ^cBemeland is almost as full of heresies as of houses. ^cSilesia is as bad: and ^cMoravia, a country there adjoining, is never a whit better. And yet do not these sects bud, where your gospel is freely and openly preached?

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here, M. Harding, I have purposely left out a great heap of your talk, not thinking it needful to answer all your void words. Having no more regard what ye say, it was no hard matter for you to call us *Libertines*, and to say, "The gospel that we preach hath none other substance, but carnal liberty, and licentious living." If ye had remembered either the city of Rome, where ye have been, or the town of Antwerp or Louvain, where ye now dwell, ye could not well without blushing have charged us with *carnal liberty*.

Our *wantons* and *flesh-worms*, for so it liketh you to call them, have been contented to forsake fathers, mothers, wives, children, goods, and livings, and meekly to submit themselves to the extreme terror of all your cruelties, and to yield their bodies unto the death: to be starved for hunger: and to be burnt in fire, only for the name and gospel of Jesus Christ. So delicate *flesh-worms*, and such *wantons* are they. Ye will say, as your wont is when ye have nothing else to say, They died stubbornly in wilful error. Yet, I reckon, ye will not say, *They died in great pleasance, or carnal liberty*. It is a strange kind of *fleshly wantonness*, for a man to deny himself, and to take up his cross, and to follow Christ. And yet is this the *whole substance of our gospel*.

Justinus the Martyr, notwithstanding he was an heathen, and thought then, even as you do now, that the professors of the name of Christ were nothing else but a sort of

wanton and wilful people, yet when he saw how constantly they died, and how patiently they suffered whatsoever was laid upon them, he was at length converted himself, and by their example became a Christian. Thus Eusebius reporteth his words: *Ego ipse Platonis disciplinis delectatus*, &c.: “I myself taking pleasure in Plato’s doctrine, and hearing the Christians ill spoken of, and seeing them to go courageously and boldly to their death, and to suffer all such things as were thought most terrible, I thought it a thing impossible, that such men should live wickedly, or in wantonness.”

Euseb. lib. 4.
cap. 8. [i.
152.]
Ἐνεβόουν
ἀδύνατον
εἶναι ἐν κα-
κίᾳ καὶ φι-
ληδονίᾳ ὑ-
πάρχειν αὐ-
τούς.

Sozomen. lib.
1. cap. 1.
[ii. 9.]
Δῆλον πᾶ-
σιν ἐποί-
ησαν, ὥς
ὑπὲρ μεγα-
λῶν ἔθλων
τὸν ἀγῶνα
τοῦτον ὑπο-
μένουσι.

Psal. cxix. 9.

So likewise writeth Sozomenus touching the same: “The Christians being spoiled of their goods, and regarding nothing that they had, being hanged on gibbets, and suffering all manner torments, so without care or sense as if their bodies had not been their own, neither allured with flattery, nor amazed with threats, they gave all men hereby to understand, that they suffered these things” (not of wantonness, but) “for some great reward.”

The prophet David saith: *In quo corrigit adolescens viam suam? In custodiendo sermones tuos*: “Whereby shall a young man” (not grow to be a *fleshly wanton*, but) “amend his life, and correct his way?” He answereth: (O Lord,) “by the keeping of thy words.”

Cyrrill. contra
Julian. lib. 7.
p. 162. [ed.
Basil. 1546.
tom. iii. ed.
Aubert. vi.
234.]

Therefore we may justly say to you, as Cyrillus said sometime to Julianus the renegade in like case: *Etiam pueri in sacris literis enutriti, statim fiunt religiosissimi, etiamsi minus eloquentes*: “Even our children being brought up in the holy scriptures, straightway become most godly, although not so eloquent, or well-spoken.”

If there be any such *flesh-worms* or *wantons* this day, they be not the *gospellers*, which word so much offendeth you: they be of you, and of yours, M. Harding, that is, not the professors, but the mockers and wilful despisers of the gospel.

Ye say: “Confession should be made unto the priest, by whom only” (ye say) “God hath promised forgiveness of sin.” I beseech you, where find you this promise? Shew the words: allege the place: regard your credit.

Otherwise ye will be noted of untruth. Where did God or Christ ever say, *Forgiveness of sin is given only by the priest*? If it be so indeed, then why doth Chrysostom say: *Nunc necessarium non est presentibus testibus confiteri.* Chrysost. de Penitent. et Confessione. [ed. Savill. v. 512.] *Solus Deus te confitentem videat*: "Now it is not needful to make confession in the presence of witnesses? Let God only see thee making thy confession⁶²?" why doth St. Hieron say: *Apud Deum non sententia sacerdotum, sed reorum vita queritur*: "It is not the sentence or absolution of the priest, but the life of the sinner that is regarded before God?" Howbeit, hereof we have sufficiently said before.

"Luther," ye say, "first procured, that men should acknowledge no one head and judge:" "whom" (as by your report St. Cyprian saith) "they might obey as the vicar of Christ." Of this *one head* and *one judge*, neither Christ nor his apostles ever told us. St. Cyprian, as it is said before, saith thus: *Christus parem dedit apostolis omnibus potestatem*: "Christ gave unto all his apostles equal power." And St. Chrysostom saith: *Quicumque desiderat primatum in terra, inveniet in celo confusionem*: "Whosoever seeketh the primacy in earth, he in heaven shall find confusion." Hieron. in Matt. xvi. [iv. 75.] Cyprian. de Simplicitate Praelatorum. [p. 195.] Chrysost. in Matt. hom. 35. in Opere Imperfect. [vi. app. 153.]

The place of St. Cyprian touching *one head* and *one judge*, is well alleged by you, M. Harding: but ill applied. It is true that St. Cyprian saith, The people ought to obey *one judge*, or *one head*, as the *vicar of Christ*. But that by the same *one head*, or *judge*, he meant either the bishop of Rome, or any one other certain several bishop, it is most untrue. St. Cyprian's meaning is, as I have elsewhere more largely declared, that in every diocese the people ought to know *one bishop* as *head* and *judge*, and him to obey, as the *vicar of Christ*. *One head* or *judge*, I say, in every diocese: not *one universal head* over all the world. For proof whereof, M. Harding, read St. Cyprian's epistle unto Florentinus Pupianus, and ye shall find that he useth the selfsame words of himself, and not of the pope: and I doubt not, but ye will much marvel, and mislike your own

⁶² [Supra vol. i. 187, note 25.]

In the former Reply, art. 4. divis. 5. [Supra vol. ii. 147.]

Cyprian, lib.
4. epist. 9.
[p. 122.]

error. His words be these: *Unde schismata et hæreses abortæ sunt, et oriuntur, nisi dum episcopus, qui unus est, et ecclesiæ præest, superba quorundam præsumptione contemnitur?* “Wherehence have schisms and heresies sprung up, or wherehence do they spring, unless it be, that the bishop, which is *one*, and ruleth the church, by the proud presumption of certain is despised?”

Art. 4. divis.
5. [Supra
vol. ii. 154.]

Here St. Cyprian calleth himself that *one bishop*, and that *one head and judge of the church*. Yet was he only the bishop of Carthage in Africa: and not the pope, or bishop of Rome. Hereof I have spoken more at large in my former Reply.

Chrysost. in
Matt. hom.
6. in Opere
imperfect
[vi. app. 55.]

Touching the pope, wherein he may be known for *Christ's vicar*, it were hard to say: unless it be for that wheresoever the pope is present, there Christ is away. Chrysostom saith: *Qui vanam gloriam non desiderat, ille debet, Christi vicarius factus, Christi justitiam prædicare:* “He that desireth not vain glory, *being made Christ's vicar*, ought to preach the justice of Christ.”

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 3. Divis. 1.

[1 Cor. i. 12.]
[Gal. ii. 11.]
[Acts xx. 39.]

Where they say, that we have fallen into sundry sects, and would be called, some of us Lutherans, and some of us Zwinglians, and cannot yet well agree among ourselves touching the whole substance of our doctrine: what would these men have said, if they had been in the first times of the apostles and holy fathers, when one said, “I hold of Paul:” another, “I hold of Cephas:” another, “I hold of Apollo?” when Paul did so sharply rebuke Peter? when upon a falling out Barnabas departed from Paul? when, as Origen mentioneth, the Christians were divided into so many factions, as that they kept no more but the name of Christians in common among them, being in no manner of thing else like to Christians? when, as Socrates saith, for their dis-

[Socrat. lib.
1. c. 6. tom.
ii. 14.]

[Vol. iv. p.
30.]

sensions and sundry sects, they were laughed and jested at openly of the people in their stages, and common game-plays? when, as Constantine the emperor affirmeth, there were such numbers of variations and brawlings in the church, that it might justly seem a misery far passing all the former miseries? when also Theophilus, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Augustine, Ruffine, Hierom, being all Christians, being all fathers, being all catholics, quarrelled one against another with most bitter and most remediless contentions without end? when, as saith Nazianzen, the parts of one body were consumed and wasted one of another? when the whole east part of the church was divided from the west, only about *leavened bread*, and only for the keeping of Easter-day: which were indeed no great matters to be strived for? and when in all councils new *creeds* and *new decrees* continually were devised?

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

The sum of M. Harding's answer hereto is this: "That the bitter dissensions, that in old times fell out amongst the learned and godly fathers, stood rather in matters of manners, and other small quarrels, than in cases and questions of the faith." For trial of the truth herein, it may please you to consider well these few.

Papias, Apollinarius, Victorinus, Tertullianus, Irenæus, Lactantius, and others⁶³, defended the heresy of the Chilistæ, that said, "Christ after the general judgment should dwell here a thousand years together upon the earth." Irenæus held, that man at the beginning, when he was first created, was unperfect. Clemens Alexandrinus and Justinus held, That the angels fell, and offended God, in

a A manifest untruth of M. Harding's.

Hieronym. 4. Hierem. lib. Irenæus, lib. 4. cap. 73. [p. 283.]

Clemen. Strom. lib. 3. et 5. [pp. 538, 650.]

Justinus in Apologia. [p. 92.]

⁶³ [In the passage of St. Jerome indicated by the marginal reference, the Editor has not found any mention of these names; but

they all occur, except Papias, in the preface to the 16th book of St. Jerome on Isaiah, tom. iii. p. 478.]

that they desired the company of women. But it shall be in vain to stand long herein. For of such examples there is great store.

Erasm. in
vita Chry-
sostomi.

Gennadius,
de Ecclesi-
ast. Scrip-
toribus. [In-
ter. Hieron.
Opp. v. 35.]
Hieron. in
Epist. ad
Augustin.
cujus initium
est, Crebras
ad me. [iv.
pt. 2. 611.]
Bonifac. 2. in
Epist. ad
Eulaliū.
[Pseudo-Isi-
dor. Mausi
viii. 732.]

Augustin. ad
Hieronym.
epist. 9. [ii.
86.]

To come near the purpose : Theophilus calleth Epiphanius *hæresiarcham*, that is, “the grand captain and father of heretics⁶⁴.” Gennadius saith : St. Augustine was not far off from being an heretic⁶⁵. St. Hierom writing unto St. Augustine saith thus : *In epistola tua, quædam hæretica esse judicavi* : “I judged, that there were certain heretical errors in your epistle.” Pope Bonifacius II. said, that Aurelius the bishop of Carthage, and St. Augustine, and other godly and learned fathers in the council of Africa, “were pricked on, and inspired by the devil⁶⁶.” St. Augustine willeth St. Hierom to acknowledge *his error, and to recant*. Thus he saith : *Accipe.....severitatem Christianam ad illud opus corrigendum atque emendandum : et παλιφθίαν, ut dicitur, cane* : “Take unto you Christian severity, to correct and amend that book” (of yours) : “and recant your error.”

Thus much I thought good briefly to touch : not meaning thereby to deface the authority of the ancient fathers : but somewhat to open the truth of M. Harding’s tale, and to shew that these and other like bishops and fathers, notwithstanding they were learned, and godly, and worthy members of the church of God, yet were they not void of their infirmities.

Erasm. in
Præf. in tom.
ii. Hieron.

Erasmus, a man of great judgment, saith thus : *Illis temporibus ingeniosa res fuit esse Christianum* : “In those days it was a great point of cunning, to know how to be a Christian man.”

Ibidem.

And again : *Illa ætate in chartis erat fides potius quam in animo : ac pæne tot erant symbola, quot professores* : “At that time” (of the ancient fathers) “the faith was in books, rather than in the heart. And in a manner there were as many sundry creeds, as there were professors of the faith.”

⁶⁴ [The Editor has not succeeded in finding this in Erasmus’ life of Chrysostom.]

⁶⁵ [Gennadius. “Error tamen illius, sermone multo, ut supe-

rius dixi, contractus, lucta hostium exaggeratus, necdum hæresis “questionem dedit.”]

⁶⁶ [Supra vol. iv. p. 386.]

Therefore Clemens Alexandrinus saith, the heathens thus upbraid the Christians for the strifes and dissensions that were among them : *Vos Christiani dissidetis inter vos, et tot sectas habetis, quæ licet omnes Christianismi titulum sibi vendicent, tamen alia aliam execratur, et condemnat. Quare vestra religio vera non est : nec a Deo originem ducit :* “ Ye Christians dissent among yourselves : and maintain so many sects. Which sects, notwithstanding they all claim the title of Christian religion, yet one of them curseth and condemneth another : therefore your religion is not true, nor hath her beginning or ground from God⁶⁷.”

Clemens
Stromat. lib.
7. [ii. 886.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 4. Divis. 1.

What would these men (trow ye) have said in those days? which side would they specially then have taken? and which would they then have forsaken? which gospel would they have believed? whom would they have accounted for *heretics*, and whom for *catholics*? and yet, what a stir and revel keep they this day, only upon the two poor names of Luther and Zwinglius? Because these two men are not yet fully resolved upon some one certain point of doctrine, therefore would they needs have us think, that both of them were deceived: that neither of them had the gospel: and, that neither of them taught the truth aright.

[Vol. iv. p.
31.]

M. HARDING.

After many things by these defenders alleged, for proof of dissension to have been among the apostles, the faithful people in St. Paul's time, the bishops and holy fathers of the primitive church, whereby they would persuade, if they could, that their own division into sects and dissensions, is not a mark of false doctrine: at length, as though they had won the field, and tried themselves proper men, triumphing over us, as though we had nothing to say, with a great courage they demand this question of us, which though it be but one in effect, yet with a kind of bravery

⁶⁷ [Clem. Strom. 7. simply says, στεύειν διὰ τὴν διαφωνίαν τῶν αἰρέ-
πρώτων μὲν οὖν αὐτὸ τοῦτο προσά-
γουσιν ἡμῖν λέγοντες, μὴ δεῖν πι-
σεων. παρατείνει γὰρ καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια,
ἄλλων ἄλλα δογματίζοντων.]

they seem to divide into sundry branches, and thus they say: What would these men (they mean the papists) then, trow ye, have said in those days? which side would they then have taken, and which would they then have forsaken? which gospel would they have believed? whom would they have accounted for heretics, and whom for catholics?

Touching these four interrogatories, if we had then been alive, being of the mind we be now of, we would have requited you with four answers of the holy and most learned father St. Hierom, and would have said, as in the like state of times in a learned epistle he said to the learned pope Damasus, touching the heresies which he found in Syria, at his first coming thither from Rome. First, *Mihi cathedram Petri, et fidem apostolico ore laudatam censui consulendam: inde nunc meæ animæ postulans cibum, unde olim Christi vestimenta suscepi.* Which words, taking upon me the person of all faithful and catholic folks, thus I English: "In these controversies, I have thought good for counsel (what I ought to believe) to repair to the chair of Peter, and to the faith of the Roman church, praised by Paul the apostle's own mouth. And from thence now require I the food of my soul, from whence I received the garments of Christ. To speak the same more shortly and more plainly: In the catholic church I look to have the food of my soul to everlasting life, in which I was first christened."

A fourfold answer to the four questions.

Epist. tom. ii. [lv. pt. 2. p. 19.] The first answer.

Secondly, we would with him have said, one speaking for all, directing our words (as he did) to those that be of the catholic faith, whom ye call papists: *Vos estis lux mundi, vos sal terræ, vos aurea vasa et argentea: hic testacea vasa vel lignea, virgam ferream, et æternum operiuntur incendium:* "Ye are the light of the world, ye are the salt of the earth, ye are golden and silver vessels: here (among the gospellers) are the earthen and wooden vessels, which must abide the iron rod, and flame everlasting."

The second answer.

Thirdly, with him (one likewise bearing the person of all) we would have said to Pius the Fourth, that now sitteth in Peter's chair, as he then said to Damasus: *Ego nullum primum nisi Christum sequens, beatitudini tuæ, id est, cathedræ Petri, communionem consocior. Super illam petram ædificatam ecclesiam scio. Quicumque extra hanc domum agnum comederit, prophanus est: si quis in arca Noe non fuerit, peribit regnante diluvio:* "Making none but Christ first of all whom to follow, I join in fellowship of communion with thy holiness, that is to say, with the see of Peter. Upon that rock I know the church is builded. Whosoever eateth the lamb without the compass of this house, he is profane. If any remain without the ark of Noe, he shall be lost, when the flood reigneth."

The third answer.

Fourthly, touching the authors of this new gospel, with the same Hierom we say, all under the person of one: *Non novi Vitalem, Meletium respuo, ignoro Paulinum. Quicumque tecum non colligit, spargit, hoc est, qui Christi non est, Antichristi est:* "Vitalis I know not, Meletius I refuse, Paulinus I wot not

The fourth answer.

what he is" (these were head heretics in St. Hierom's time). "Whosoever gathereth not together with thee" (holy pastor), "he scattereth abroad, that is to wit, who is not of Christ's side, he is of Antichrist's side." To transfer this to ourselves, the names changed, the case remaining like, for our answer to our gospel prelates, we say: Luther we know not: Zwinglius, Œcolampadius, Bucer, Peter Martyr, Latimer, Ridley, Cranmer, Hooper we reject and refuse: Calvin, Beza, Jewel, Pilkinton, Grindal, Horne, and their fellows, what they are, we wot not. We see they are not gatherers with the supreme pastor of the catholic church, but scatterers⁶⁷.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

It appeareth by that hath been already said, that the gospel of Christ is now misliked and doubted of you, as it was in old times of the infidels and heathens. Chrysostom thereof saith thus: *Venit Gentilis, et dicit, Vellem fieri Christianus: sed nescio, cui adhæream. Multæ inter vos* Chrysost. in Acta hom. 33. [ix. 358.] *sunt pugnæ, seditiones, ac tumultus. Nescio, quod dogma eligam, quod præferam. Singuli dicunt, Ego verum dico:* "The infidel or heathen cometh, and saith: *I would be a Christian man: but I know not whom I should follow. There is much strife, and dissension, and trouble amongst you. I cannot tell, what doctrine to choose, to set before other. For every one of you will say, I say the truth.*" As ye agree well with them in form of words, so I pray God, ye agree not with them in faith, and spirit, and contempt of God. The same Chrysostom speaking, not only of the heretics, but also of the faithful Christians, that were in his time, saith thus: *Hanc ob causam ridiculi facti sumus, et gentibus, et Judæis: dum ecclesia in mille partes discinditur:* "For this cause we are scorned and laughed at, both of Jews and Gentiles: while as the church is thus rent into a thousand parts."

Therefore it was not amiss, M. Harding, to demand you this question, which of these sides ye would have followed: and which of all these gospels ye would have believed. For it may well be thought, that being minded as they were, ye would have answered as they did.

⁶⁷ [Harding goes at tedious length into various heresies of the gossellers, as he calls them.]

But ye say, ye would rather have said, as St. Hierom sometime said to pope Damasus, touching the heresies which he found in Syria.

If ye would use St. Hierom's answer, M. Harding, and would say unto the pope, as St. Hierom said, perhaps ye should deserve no great thanks for your labour. For St. Hierom in that selfsame place, beside sundry others, utterly denieth the *primacy* of the bishop of Rome. His words be plain: *Ego nullum primum, nisi Christum, sequens, beatitudini tuæ, id est, cathedræ Petri communione consocior*: "I following no first man," (that is to say, no head or chief) "but only Christ, am joined as a fellow in communion unto thy blessedness, that is to say, unto Peter's chair." St. Hierom telleth the pope, He knoweth no first, no chief, no head, no not the pope himself, but only Christ. Again, he saith not, I am thrall and subject to thy commandments: but, I am joined as a fellow in communion unto thy blessedness. Fellowship will hardly stand with that universal power, which you imagine the pope ought to have over the whole church of God. Verily the pope himself would take it in scorn, if you this day would follow St. Hierom, and call him your fellow.

Hieronym.
ad Damasum. [iv. pt. 2. p. 19.]
Nullum primum.
Beatitudini tue communionem consocior.

But St. Hierom saith: "He agreeth in faith and religion with Damasus." And what great marvel is this, that being a godly learned man, he would leave Vitalis, and Meletius, and other heretics, and rather join himself to that bishop, whom he knew to be godly and catholic? Hereof he writeth thus himself: *Vineam Christi exterminant vulpes: ut inter lacus contritos, qui aquam non habent, difficile, ubi fons signatus, et hortus ille conclusus sit, possit intelligi. Ideo mihi cathedram Petri, et fidem apostoli ore laudatam censui consulendam*: "The foxes destroy the vineyard of Christ: so that among these broken cisterns, that have no water, it is hard to understand, where is that sealed fountain, and that enclosed orchard. Therefore I thought it good to hearken to St. Peter's chair, and to that faith, which was commended by the apostle's mouth."

Hieronym.
ad Damasum. [Ibid.]

St. Hierom from his youth was brought up in Rome: he was christened in Rome: he had been a student in

Rome: he had taught a school in Rome: he had been secretary to Damasus the bishop of Rome: he was a priest of Rome: and of late they have furnished him also with a *cardinal's hat*, as if he had been a *cardinal of Rome*: and as it is thought by some, saving for some displeasure that certain of the clergy had conceived against him, he was like to be chosen the bishop of Rome. What great marvel therefore is it, if he had some special affection to the see of Rome? Alphonsus de Castro saith, That the Franciscan *friars* be sworn to Duns: and that he heard a Dominican *friar* say openly in his sermon: "That he was to be suspected as an heretic, that in any thing dissented from Thomas of Aquine⁶⁸." There is no man lightly, but hath a special credit in some one man before all others.

In vita Hieronym.

Alphons. ad. vers. Hæres. lib. 1. cap. 7. [p. 39 et 38.]

But how holdeth this argument, M. Harding: St. Hierom joined with a godly bishop: *ergo*, we must join with a wicked bishop? or, St. Hierom agreed in faith and religion with Damasus: *ergo*, we must agree with one, that doth all things of purpose contrary to Damasus? So might you say, The godly people of the Jews were bound to obey Aaron and Moses: *ergo*, all others, that followed afterward, were likewise bound to obey Annas and Caiphas.

The faith of Christ, M. Harding, goeth not always by *succession*. The bishops of Rome have been Arians, Nestorians, Monothelites, and otherwise found in horrible heresies, as hereafter shall be shewed. Would ye in such cases have recourse to such a one, only for that he sitteth in Peter's *chair*? would ye say to such a one: "You are the salt of the earth: you are the light of the world?" would ye say: "This is the faith that was commended by the apostle's mouth?"

Truly, St. Hierom himself, when he saw abuses or errors maintained in the church of Rome, made small account of St. Peter's *chair*. For thus he saith: *Quid mihi profers*

Hieronym. ad Evagrium. [iv. pt. 2. 803.]

⁶⁸ [P. 39 a. "Valde displicet mihi, quod nostrum sodalitium in verba Scoti fere jurasse videtur." P. 38 d. "Hi qui humanis scriptis dissentire impium autumant. . . . quales ego vidi in tan-

"tam insaniam devenisse, ut non sint veriti ad populum in publica concione hoc effundere: Quisquis a b. Thomæ sententia discesserit suspectus de hæresi est censendus."]

unius urbis consuetudinem? Potentia divitiarum, et paupertatis humilitas, vel sublimiorem, vel inferiorem episcopum non facit. Ceterum omnes apostolorum successores sunt: "What tellest thou me of the custom of that one city" (of Rome)? "The power of riches, and the humility of poverty cannot make a bishop either higher, or lower. All bishops are the successors of the apostles."

"As for Luther, Zwinglius, Peter Martyr, Calvin and others," ye say, "ye know them not." Neither doth it so greatly force, whom you list to know. God give you grace
 2 Tim. ii, 19, to know yourselves. The Lord is able to know his own.

Touching the *dissensions in religion*, which ye imagine to be amongst us in the church of England, I will say nothing. It grieveth you full sore, to see, that in all the Articles of the faith, and in the whole substance of doctrine, we do so quietly join together. The ancient father Leo, of the like case, saith thus: *Diabolus gentium vocatione cruciatur, et quotidiana potestatis suæ destructione torquetur: dolens utique se deserì, et verum Regem in locis omnibus adorari. Parat fraudes: fingit dissensiones*: "The devil is sore grieved with the calling of the heathens" (to the faith), "and with the daily decreasing of his power: sorrowing to see himself forsaken, and" (Christ) "the true King to be worshipped in all places. *Therefore he deviseth guiles: and imagineth dissensions.*"

Leo in Epi-
 phania, serm.
 6. [i. 197.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 5. *Divis.* 1.

But good God, what manner of fellows be these,^[Vol. iv. p. 31.] which blame us for disagreeing? and do all they themselves, ween you, agree well together? is every one of them fully resolved what to follow? have there been no strifes, no quarrels, no debates amongst themselves at no time? why then do the Scotists and the Thomists, about that they call *meritum congrui, et meritum condigni*, no better agree together? why agree they no better among themselves, concerning *original sin in the blessed Virgin*:

concerning a *solemn vow*, and a *single vow*? why say their canonists, that *auricular confession* is appointed by the *positive law of man*: and their schoolmen contrariwise, that it is appointed by the *law of God*? why doth Albertus Pius [*l. Pighius*] dissent from Cajetan? why doth Thomas dissent from Lombardus, Scotus from Thomas, Occamus from Scotus, Alliacensis from Occamus? and why do their *nominals* disagree from their *reals*? And yet say I nothing of so many diversities of *friars* and *monks*: how some of them put a great holiness in eating of fish, and some in eating of herbs: some in wearing of shoes, and some in wearing of sandals: some in going in a linen garment, and some in woollen: some of them called white, some black: some being shaven broad, and some narrow: some stalking upon pattens⁶⁹, some going bare-footed: some girt, and some ungirt. They ought ye wiss to remember, there be some of their own company, which say, that the body of Christ is in his supper *naturally*: contrary, other some of the selfsame company deny it utterly. Again, that there be others of them, which say, the body of Christ in the holy communion is *rent and torn with teeth*: and some again, that deny the same. Some also of them there be, which write, that the body of Christ in the sacrament is *quantum*, (that is to say, hath his perfect *quantity* in the sacrament:) some others again say, nay. That there be others of them, which say, Christ did *consecrate* with a certain divine power: some, that he did the same with his blessing: some again that say, he did it with uttering five solemn chosen words: and some, with

S. Gardiner
in Sophistica
Diaboli:
Richard Fa-
ber: Recan-
tatio Beren-
garii Schola
et Glossa:
Guimundus:
de Consec.
dist. 2. Ego
Bereng.

[Supra vol.
ii. 392.]

Thomas.

⁶⁹ [Lat. "soleati."]

rehearsing the same words afterward again. Some will have it, that, when Christ did speak those five words, the material wheaten bread was pointed unto by this demonstrative pronoun *hoc*: some had rather have, that a certain *vagum individuum*, as they term it, was meant thereby. Again, others there be, that say, *dogs and mice* may truly and in very deed eat the body of Christ: and others again there be, that steadfastly deny it. There be others, which say, that the very accidents of bread and wine may nourish: others again there be, which say, that the substance of the bread returneth again by a miracle⁷⁰: what need I say more? It were over long and tedious, to reckon up all. So uncertain, and full of doubts, is yet the whole form of these men's religion and doctrine, even amongst themselves, from whom it sprang, and grew up first. For hardly at any time do they well agree between themselves: except it be peradventure, as, in times past, the Pharisees and Sadducees: or as Herod and Pilate accorded together against Christ.

[Supra vol.
iii. 464.]

Gardiner.

[Supra vol.
iii. 455.]

M. HARDING.

Whatsoever ye bring for some show of diversity and dissension to be found among the catholics, it may be reduced to two heads. The one containeth a diversity in points of learning: the other in trades of life. Concerning matters of learning, thanked be our Lord, for that the very enemies of the catholic church cannot charge the catholics with dissension in any of the grounds and Articles of our faith. As for small matters and questions disputable on both sides, they may therein dissent one learned man from another without blame, the faith remaining inviolated.....

The dissensions with which the defenders charge the catholic church.

But, good sir defender, what meant you to name the nominals and reals? understand you what they be? If a man should upon the sudden demand of you that question, ^a perhaps you would be to seeking of an answer. Sir, if you be an Oxford man, as I suppose you be, you may remember, if ever you learned your

a A great doubtful question. Every poor logician may easily know it.

⁷⁰ [Lat. simply "redire substantiam."]

logic after that trade it was taught in, when we resorted to the *parvis* there, what ado was made in daily disputations for exercise of young wits, about *genus* and *species*, and the rest of the universals : whether they were *termini primæ* or *secundæ intentionis*, whether they were *entia realia* or *rationis*. Which is a matter pertaining to logic, not to divinity. Now some schoolmen be of the opinion, that the five universals be *termini*, or *nomina secundæ intentionis*, and they be called thereof *nominals*. Some hold opinion, they are *entia realia*, and thereof they be named *reals*, &c. In the behalf of those holy religious men, we tell you, ye are to blame to bely them. For what discipline and order of life soever they have addicted themselves unto, for better opportunity to serve God, truth is truth, they put not great holiness (as ye say) in eating of fish, nor of herbs : in shoes, nor in sandals : in linen, nor in woollen garments : in white, nor in black : in broad, nor in narrow crowns : in going on pattens, nor on the bare ground : in girding themselves, nor in being ungirded. They be not so ignorant as to put holiness in such outward things, though their obedience, performed in the humble observation of these outward things according to their rule, be an holy thing. These things they use for restraint of their will, and for discipline, according to the order and rule, under which, the better to serve God, they have promised obediently and humbly to live. Neither put they more holiness in the things by you scoffed at, than Elias did in his mantle and leathern girdle, wherewith he girded his loins : than John Baptist did in eating of locusts and wild honey, in wearing a garment of camel's hair, and in girding himself about the loins with a skin.....

The catholic religious men put no holiness in outward observances.

To what end be those observances of the religious.

Elias,
2 Kings i. 8.
John Baptist,
Matt. iii. 4.

But I pray you, sirs, who be ye? if we would follow your lightness, have we not like matter of diversity in outward things to twit you withal : but that your diversity is with breach of due order and law, and that of religious men is according to order and rule? if ye think diversity in things of their own nature indifferent, as meats, apparel, shaving, &c. worthy to be reprehended, and deduce from thence an argument of mutual dissension : among your ministering clergy is not likewise diversity found? do not some among you wear square caps, some round caps, some button caps, some only hats : do not some wear side gowns having large sleeves, with tippets, which is not well liked of your sect : some of more perfection Turkey gowns, gaberdines, frocks, or nightgowns of the most lay fashion, for avoiding of superstition?.....The thing is indifferent, and may be yielded unto, saith the one sect : they be the pope's rags, and may not be worn, saith the other sect. And therefore they will rather be justly put from that, which justly they cannot keep, than yield one jot. Neither her majesty's commandment, nor their metropolitan's decree care they for. They had liever seem to the people, whom they use for their clawbacks, and to whose judgment they stand or fall, stout champions of their own gospel,

than meek followers of Christ's gospel. Such mighty Sampsons, such constant Laurences your jolly gospel breedeth.....

Some say, the body of Christ in the communion is torn and crushed with teeth, some deny it: yea forsooth, and both mean right well. The hundred and thirteen bishops assembled in council at Rome under pope Nicolas the Second, prescribed such form of recantation to Berengarius, the first author of the sacramentary heresy, openly there to pronounce, acknowledge, and with subscription to ratify, as he should confess the very true body of Christ, not only the sacrament thereof, sensibly and in verity to be handled with the hands of the priests, ^b to be broken and crushed with teeth of the faithful. By which words these fathers' mind was to express a verity of real presence, ^c a true eating of Christ's body indeed, and to exclude the only spiritual eating, so as the old fathers did eat Christ in their manna. Neither is this doctrine dissonant from the fathers, specially from Chrysostom, who hath the like words, hom. 45. in *Johan*..... Howsoever our Saviour Christ consecrated, with a certain divine power, or with his almighty blessing, or with utterance of words, or with repeating the same words: whatsoever the pronoun *hoc* pointeth or signifieth in the words of consecration: whatsoever your dogs and mice have eaten, or yourselves have trodden under your wicked feet: whether the accidents do nourish, or substance return: what narrow points soever the schoolmen, after tossing of arguments to and fro, as their manner is, have agreed or disagreed upon: the matter is subtle and curious, neither determined by definite sentence of the church in any council. And therefore, sith it containeth no article of our faith, let us not be offended with the whetting and sharpening of their subtle wits, in matters neither to the truth of God's word prejudicial, nor to the understanding and judgment of any man hurtful.....

Christ's body torn with teeth, how is it understood?

Berengarius' recantation.

^b This was a blasphemous and horrible error.

^c The true eating of Christ's body is spiritual: this imagined eating with mouth and teeth is heathenish and fantastical, and hath no truth.

Curious questions not defined by holy church in any council.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Touching your *nominals* and *reals*, M. Harding, if ye had been so cunning and skilful as ye make yourself, ye would not have sent us back to learn your *first* and *second intentions* amongst children. But, that ye may understand your own error, and certainly see, that these two houses, your *nominals* and your *reals*, have heretofore kept a stir, not only in *logic*, but also in your *scholastical* matters of *divinity*, without further searching of the bottom hereof, I pray you only to consider these few authorities.

Veselus, sometime, for his great fame in learning, named *Lux Mundi*, writeth thus: *In nominalibus si quid fidei contrarium putarem, hodie remearem, vel ad formales, vel*

Veselus.

ad reales : “ If I thought there were any thing in the *nominals* contrary to the faith, I would presently leave them, and go either to the *formals*, or to the *reals*.”

Another saith : *Ex sententiariis, alii terminales, aut nominales esse volunt : alii reales* : “ Of the doctors of the scholastical divinity, some will be called *terminales* or *nominales*, and some *reales*.” Another saith : *Citius e labyrinthis temet explices, quam ex involucris realium, nominalium, &c. in quibus omnibus tantum est eruditionis,.....ut putem* [leg. *existimen*] *apostolis ipsis opus fore alio spiritu, si cogarentur* [leg. *cogantur*] *istis de rebus cum hoc novo theologorum genere conserere manus* : “ Ye may sooner wind yourself out of a maze, than out of the shifts and corners of *these reales* and *nominales*, &c. in whom there is such abundance of learning, that I think the apostles themselves should have need of another spirit, if at any time they should be driven to encounter with this *new kind of divines*.” Here, M. Harding, your *nominales* and *reales*, are called a *new kind*, not of *logicians*, but of *divines*. And if ye consider well Udalrichus Zasius, ye shall find, that your said *nominals* and *reals* have intruded themselves, not only into *divinity*, but also into the *civil law*. There-fore it was somewhat out of season, to tell us this tale, of your *second* and *first intentions*.

“ Concerning apparel,” ye say, “ ye set not great holiness, neither in shoes nor in sandals,” &c. Whereby ye would seem to give us to understand, that ye set *some holiness* in these things, although *not great*. Neither doth it appear, that the Pharisees ever made any *great account* of holiness of their garments. Yet notwithstanding under the colour and shadow thereof they deceived the people. And therefore Christ saith unto them, “ Woe be unto you, ye *Scribes and Pharisees* :” and unto the people he saith, “ Beware of them that love to go in long robes.” Of such men Seneca saith : *Personam habere malunt, quam faciem* : “ They will rather wear a vizard, than a natural face.” Another saith : *Dolosi hominis, dolosæ vestes* : “ *Crafty man, crafty coat*.”

But if no man ever reckoned any holiness to be in your

Illyriens de
Sectis, p. 80.

Erasm. in
Moria, [opp.
vol. iv. p.
375.]

Udal. Zasius,
de Generum
obligatione.
[in ff. vet.
tom. i. p.
252.]

Matt. xxiii.

27.

Mark xii. 38.

Luke xx. 46.
Seneca.

Macrobius.

Concil. Gangren. cap. 12.
[ed. 2. Crabb.
i. 290.]

apparel, wherefore then was this decree so long ago written in the council of Gangra: *Si quis virorum putaverit sancto proposito, id est continentiae, convenire, ut pallio utatur, tanquam ex eo justitiam habiturus, &c. anathema sit*: "If any man think it agreeable to his holy purpose of continent life, to wear a cloak, as though thereby he may be justified, &c. accursed be he." Or, wherefore doth St. Chrysostom cry out against such folly, used, as it may appear, in his time? *O impietatem! Majorem sanctitatem in vestimentis suis volunt ostendere, quam in corpore Christi, &c. Ut desperans de misericordia Dei, confidat in veste hominis*: "O the wickedness hereof! They will shew more holiness in their own apparel, than in the body of Christ, &c. That he that despaireth of God's mercy should put his trust in the garment of a man."

Chrysost. in Matt. hom. 43. In opere imperf. [vi. app. 184.]

T. Aquinas.

Or wherefore doth Thomas of Aquine tell us so certainly, that the wearing of Francis' or Dominic's cowl had power to remove sin, as well as the sacrament of baptism? or wherefore doth your bishop, in hallowing the priest's vestiments, say thus: *Ut sacerdotes tui hac sacra veste induti, ab omnibus impulsionebus, seu tentationibus malignorum spirituum muniti, et defensi esse mereantur*: "That thy priests wearing this holy vesture, may deserve to be shielded and defended from all assaults and tentations of the wicked spirits."

In Pontifical. in Benedict. ad Vestimenta Sacerdotal. [pt. 2. tit. x.]

Durand. in Rational. lib. 3. cap. 1.

Your doctor Durand furnisheth out your priest at mass in his complete harness: *a capo a pie. Amictus est pro galea, &c.*: "His amice," saith he, "is his head-piece:" his "albe" is "his coat of mail:" his "girdle" is "his bow:" his "subcingle" is "his quiver:" his "stole" is "his spear:" his "maniple" is "his club:" his "chisible" is "his target." And in the end he saith: *Hæc sunt arma, quibus pontifex, vel sacerdos armari debet, contra spirituales nequitias pugnaturus*: "These be the pieces, wherewith the bishop or priest must be harnessed, that will fight against the spiritual wickedness." Thus much, I trow, he would not have said, without some opinion of special holiness.

Extr. de Cons. Eccl. vel Altaris. Quod in dubiis.

To be short, wherefore do your doctors keep such hot schools amongst themselves, whether if the sextine happen

to mend his hallowed vestiment with a thread unhallowed, the whole vestiment be not thereby become unhallowed? how could these so doubtful matters ever have fallen in question amongst your fellows, if ye had been fully and thoroughly persuaded, that there is no holiness in your apparel? The ancient father Lactantius saith: *Vestes, gemmas, et cætera, quæ habentur in pretio, si quis putet Deo chara, is plane, quid Deus sit, nescit*: "If any man think, that apparel, precious stones, or other like things that we have in estimation, are pleasant or delectable unto God, undoubtedly he knoweth not what is God." Lactan. lib. 6. cap. 25.

"But," ye say, "whatsoever your apparel be, yet your obedience is very holy." The *obedience* ye mean, is to do whatsoever your abbot shall bid you do: as to carry baskets from Palestina to Damasco⁷¹: to sit seven years together in silence, without speaking of any word: for the space of twelve months, twice every day to water a dead tree: and briefly, to do whatsoever fond business ye be commanded: as it is written of one, that at the commandment of his abbot, threw out his child into the stream⁷². This, I trow, is that *obedience* that ye commend to be so holy. In vita Johannis Damasceni. Cassianus [De inst. Renunt.] lib. 4. cap. 27.

But St. Paul saith: "Ye are bought with price: make not yourselves slaves unto men." And St. Ambrose saith: *Servi hominum sunt, qui humanis se subjiçunt superstitionibus*: "They are the slaves of men, that make themselves subject unto men's superstitions." God himself saith unto you: "Who required these things at your hands?" 1 Cor. vii. 23. St. Hierom saith: *Viros fuge, quos videris catenatos: quibus fæminei, contra apostolum, sunt crines: hircorum barba: nigrum pallium: et nudi patientia frigoris pedes. Hæc omnia argumenta sunt diaboli*: "Flee those men, that thou shalt see go in chains: that, contrary to the apostle's commandment, wear long hair, as women: that are bearded like goats: that have upon them a black cloak: that go barefoot, patiently bearing the cold. All these be tokens of Ambros. 1 Cor. vii. [il. app. 135.] Isa. i. 12. Hieronym. ad Eustochium, de Virginitate servanda. [iv. pt. 2. 40.]

⁷¹ [This life by John patriarch of Constantinople will be found in the Basle ed. of Damascene's works, 1559.]

⁷² [Cassianus. The whole chapter is worth reading, if one would

learn to what excesses the perversion of Christian self-denial may lead. The abbot declared (as by revelation) that the father named in the text had wrought the work of Abraham.]

Alphonsus
advers. Hie-
res. lib. 1.
cap. 7.

the devil." Alphonsus de Castro, one of your own, saith : *Paulus quidem jussit captivare intellectum nostrum, sed in obsequium Christi, non autem in obsequium hominum* : " Indeed Paul hath commanded us to submit our understanding, but unto the obedience of Christ, not unto the obedience of men."

The godly learned men, at whose persons it pleaseth you so rudely to scoff, that refuse either to go in your apparel, or otherwise to shew themselves like unto you, have age sufficient, and can answer for themselves. Notwithstanding, thus much I may say in their behalf: Neither do they commend any manner of apparel, as holy: nor do they condemn any apparel, as unholy. This is your proper and peculiar error, M. Harding, to make so deep account of outward shows.

Eusebius,
lib. 4. cap. 11.
[l. 157.]

Ἐν φιλο-
σόφου σχή-
ματι πρεσ-
βεύων τὸν
λόγον.

Eusebius,
lib. 3. cap. 41.
[leg. lib. 5.
cap. 24. tom.
i. 243.]

ὁ τὸ πέτα-
λον πεφο-
ρηκώς.

Augustin. de
Civ. lib. 19.
cap. 19. [vii.
563.]

They know, that Eusebius saith: "Justinus Martyr preached the gospel of Christ, being apparelled as an heathen philosopher:" and yet the philosopher's weed was no hinderance to the gospel. They know, that John the Evangelist preached God's word at Ephesus, wearing upon him the *bishop's brooch*, as if he had been a bishop of the Jews. St. Augustine saith: *Nihil sane ad istam pertinet civitatem, quo habitu, vel more vivendi, si non est contra divina præcepta, istam fidem, qua pervenitur ad Deum, quisque sectetur. Unde ipsos quoque philosophos, quando Christiani fiunt, non habitum, vel consuetudinem victus, quæ nihil impedit religionem, sed falsa dogmata mutare compellit*: "It pertaineth nothing unto this city" (of God), "in what kind of apparel, or in what order of life, so that it be not against God, any man follow this faith, whereby we come unto God. Therefore, when philosophers become Christians, the church compelleth them not to change their apparel, or manner of living, which can nothing hinder religion, but only she compelleth them to change their false opinions." St. Hilary saith: *Ad ecclesiæ decus detracta a diabolo* [Bened. leg. *detracta ab his diabolo*] *gentium spolia dividuntur*: "The spoils of the heathens, taken from the devil, are divided to the furniture and ornament of the church of God." St. Hierom saith: *Episcopus, presbyter, et diaconus, et reliquus ordo ecclesiasticus in ad-*

Hilar. in
Psal. lxxvii.
[p. 197.]

Hieron. ad-
versus Pe-
lagian. lib. 1.
[iv. pt. 2.
502.]

ministracione sacrificiorum candida veste procedit: "The bishop, priest, and deacon, and the other ecclesiastical company, at the administration of the sacrifice, come forth in *white apparel*⁷²." St. Chrysostom, unto the priests and deacons, saith thus: *Hæc est dignitas vestra:..... hæc corona: non quia, induti tunicam candidissimam, per ecclesiam ambulatis*: "This is your dignity: this is your garland: not that ye walk through the church in *white apparel*." Chrysost. in Matt. hom. 83. [vii. 789.]

They say not therefore, that the apparel is either *holy* or *unholy*: but they may truly say, the same apparel of your part hath been foully abused to filthy purposes. They may justly say, they would not gladly in any appearance shew themselves like unto them, that have so untruly and so long deceived the world. And herein they are not without sundry authorities and examples of the godly fathers. St. Augustine saith, his mother left bringing of *wine and cakes* to the church, not for that it was ungodly or unlawful of itself so to do, but only for that she was warned, it was a resemblance of the superstition of the heathens: and therefore she left it. St. Gregory speaking of the *three sprinklings or dippings into the holy font*, saith thus: *...In una fide nihil officit consuetudo ecclesiæ diversa. ...Tamen, quod hæretici id facerent, negant idem esse a catholicis faciendum*⁷³: "The faith being one, the diversity of customs hurteth nothing. Yet forasmuch as *heretics have thus done*, they say that the catholics may in no wise do the same:" not for that the thing itself was ill of itself, but for that they would not seem to follow heretics. Augustin. Confess. lib. 6. cap. 2. [i. 120.] Quod superstitioni Gentilium essent simillima.

Gabriel Biel saith, the church of Rome thought it good to use common *leavened bread* at the ministration of the holy mysteries, lest in using *unleavened bread* they should be thought to follow Ebion the heretic. Tertullian reasoneth vehemently, that a Christian man ought not to go with a *laurel garland* upon his head: and that for none other Gabriel. lect. 38. [leg. lect. 34. H. fol. lxxv.] Tertull. de Corona Militis. [cap. 10. p. 106.]

⁷² [S. Hieron. "Quæ sunt, "conus &c....processerint?"]
 "rogo, inimicitie contra Deum,
⁷³ [Bishop Jewel in this last
 "si tunicam habuero mundiorem,
 sentence gives the sense of Gre-
 "si episcopus, presbyter, et dia-
 gory's advice, not his words.]

B. Rhenan.
[Argument.]
in Librum
de Corona
Militis.

cause, but only for that the *heathens* used so to go. Whereupon Beatus Rhenanus giveth this note: *Non solum ab his temperandum fuit, quæ manifestam præ se ferrent impietatem, sed etiam ab illis quæ possent indifferentia vocari, hoc est, quæ essent neque bona, neque mala: partim, ne quisquam infirmior ex Christianis offenderetur: partim, ne ethnici in suis erroribus confirmarentur, dum rectius putant esse quod etiam Christianos observare vident.* “It was meet for them to refrain, not only from such things as have a manifest show of wickedness, but also from such things as might be called *indifferent*, that is to say, neither good nor ill: partly, lest any of the *weaker Christians* should be offended: partly also, lest the *heathens* should be encouraged in their errors, thinking that thing, for that the *Christians* themselves do it, to be the better.” Again Tertullian saith: *De hoc primo consistam, an cum ipsis quoque nationibus communicare in hujusmodi servus Dei debeat: sive habitu, sive victu, vel quo alio genere lætitiæ earum:* “Herein will I first stand, whether it be lawful for the servant of God to communicate with whole nations in such things: *either in apparel, or in diet, or in any other kind of their mirth.*”

Tertull. de
Idolatria.
[cap. 13. p.
93.]

Basil. de Na-
tali Christi.
[ii. app. 602.]

And St. Basil saith: Συγάζω τὰ περιττὰ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεοῦ: “Let needless and superfluous things be put to silence in the church of God⁷³.” To be short, Origen saith: *Quærendum est, quid hoc sit quod sequitur, Non fiant ei reliquiæ: ne aliqua, inquit, rescindatis Chaldæorum, aliqua reservetis. Ob id jubet, ne pusillum quidem relinquatur in ea:* “We must examine, what is meant by this that followeth: *Leave her no manner of remnant.* The meaning is this, Abolish not certain of the superstitions of the Chaldees, reserving certain: therefore he commandeth, that nothing be left in her, *be it never so little.*” Howbeit, I take not upon me to enter into the conscience of others.

Origen. in
Jeremi. hom.
3. [ed. Basil.
1545. tom. ii.
658.]

Rom. xiv. 5. “Let each man abound in his own sense.”

Yet, M. Harding, forasmuch as ye make such a reckoning of your antiquity, as if all your orders and ceremonies

⁷³ [S. Basil. de Natali Christi. Bened. Edd., and therefore placed This is accounted spurious by the in the Appendix.]

had undoubtedly been conveyed over unto you from Christ himself and his apostles, may it therefore please you to understand, that at the beginning there appeareth no such distinction or difference of apparel in the ministry. Valafredus Abbas saith: *Veteres communi indumento utentes, celebrabant missas*: "The old fathers said mass," (that is to say, ministered the holy communion,) "having on *their own common apparel*."

St. Augustine in his rule to his clerks, or monks, writeth thus: *Ne sit notabilis habitus vester*: "Let not your apparel be notable." St. Hierom, describing the order of the church of Bethlehem, saith thus: *In veste nulla discretio nulla admiratio: utcunque placuerit incedere, nec detractionis est, nec laudis*: "In apparel there is no difference: there is no wondering. Howsoever any man list to go, it is neither slandered, nor praised." And pope Cœlestinus the First saith: *Discernendi sumus a plebe, doctrina, non veste: conversatione, non habitu: mentis puritate, non cultu. Si enim studere incipiamus novitati, traditum nobis a patribus ordinem calcabimus, ut locum vacuum [al. supervacuis] superstitionibus faciamus.... Docendi potius sunt rudium animi, quam illudendi. Nec imponendum est illorum oculis, sed mentibus infundenda præcepta sunt*: "We must be known from the lay-people by our doctrine, *not by our coat*: by our conversation, *not by our apparel*: by the pureness of our mind, *not by the attire of our body*. For, if we once begin to devise novelties, we shall tread our fathers' orders under foot, and make room for superstition. The minds of the ignorant ought to be taught, and not to be mocked. Neither may we go about to dazzle their eyes: but rather ought to pour wholesome doctrine into their hearts." Here you see, by the pope's own judgment, that your superstitious choice of apparel serveth not for increase of holiness, but rather for the *deceiving* and *mocking* of the people. To conclude, it is noted in your own Gloss upon the Clementines: *Clerici sæculares non habent certum habitum, cum non sit expressum in jure de colore, vel forma: per quæ, vel quorum alterum oportet habitum discerni*: "Secular priests have no certain apparel appointed them,

Augustin. in
Regula Mo-
nach. [i. 791.]

Hieronym. ad
Marcellam,
ut commigret
Bethleem.
[iv. pt. 2.
551.]

Cœlest. 1.
in Epist.
[2da.] ad
Episcop.
Gallie, cap.
1. [Crabb. i.
526.]

Clem. 1. de
Elect. ca. 1.
Gloss. ulti-
ma [col. 24.
lit. m.]

forasmuch as there is no express mention made, neither of the colour, nor of the form : by which two differences, or by the one of them, apparel must be discerned."

God's name be blessed : the religion of Christ may stand both with and without these things. But without such props, the whole roof of your religion must needs come down, as having nothing else but shows and vanities to bear it up.

But lest ye should conceive over great opinion of so small a matter, and think there can be none other apparel meet and comely for the clergy, but only yours: or, that without the same, the whole church of Christ must needs go to waste : may it like you therefore to remember, what the ancient father Origen hath written of you in this behalf: *Non solum apud Judæos, sed etiam apud nos, multos est invenire, peccata hujusmodi peccantes, et glutientes camelos, in eo, quod maxima delicta committunt. Et oportet hujusmodi homines frequenter considerare, quomodo in rebus minimis religionem suam ostendant : et bene eos hypocritas appellat* : " We may find, not only amongst the Jews, but also amongst ourselves, men that offend in such faults, swallowing down whole camels, in that they commit great offences. And we ought well to mark such manner of men, how they countenance out their religion with small matters. *Very well and justly Christ calleth them hypocrites.*"

Origen. in
Matt. tract.
25. [iii. 843.]

Posidonius, writing the life of St. Augustine, saith thus : *Vestis ejus, et calceamenta, et lectualia ex moderato et competentis habitu erant : nec nitida nimium, nec abjecta plurimum. Quia his plerunque vel jactare se nimium homines solent, vel abjicere : ex utroque non quæ Jesu Christi, sed quæ sua sunt, quærentes* : " Augustine's apparel, shoes, and bedding were of a competent and mean making : neither over fresh, nor over homely. For in such things men use oftentimes either to vaunt, or to abase themselves above measure : *in either side seeking their own, and not that pertaineth to Jesus Christ.*"

Posidon. in
vita August.

Augustin. de
Serm. Dom.
in Monte,
lib. 2. [cap.
12. tom. iii.
pt. 2. 216.]

St. Augustine saith : *Ex cæteris ejus operibus potest conjici, utrum hoc contemptu superflui cultus, an ambitione*

aliqua faciat. Quia et sub ovina pelle cavendos lupos Dominus præcepit: “We may gather by the rest of his works, whether he do thus” (attire himself) “in contempt of superfluous apparel, or else for ambition, that he may be noted. For our *Lord hath commanded us to beware of the wolf, even under the sheep’s skin.*” Again he saith: *Illum parcum habitum, ac necessarium, etiam simulatores sæpius usurpant, ut incautos decipiant:* “That homely kind of apparel, standing only in necessities, hypocrites and dissemblers do for the more part counterfeit, to the end they may deceive men, before they be ware.” Thus much only by the way, lest ye should think more of your coat, than it is worthy.

Some say: “The body of Christ in the sacrament is torn and crushed with teeth: and some deny it.” “Yea forsooth,” say you, “and both mean right well.” Thus would ye not say, M. Harding, if ye knew, what it were to eat the body of Christ.

St. Cyprian [*i. St. Chrysostom*] saith: *Iste panis replet mentem, non ventrem:* “This bread feedeth the mind, and not the belly.” We eat it with the spiritual tooth of our faith, not with the material tooth of our body. Your very Gloss, be it never so blind, was able to see that these words, *to tear and to crush Christ’s body with your bodily teeth*, can hardly have so catholic, and so good a meaning, as you imagine. The words thereof be these: *Nisi sane intelligas verba Berengarii, in majorem incidēs hæresim, quam ipse habuit. Et ideo omnia referas ad species ipsas:* “Unless thou discreetly understand these words of Berengarius, thou shalt fall into a greater heresy, than he had any. Therefore these words must have relation to the forms,” and not unto Christ’s very body. It followeth therefore that the catholic construction, that you gather hereof, must needs be this: “Christ’s body is crushed, and torn with teeth,” that is to say, “Christ’s body is not crushed, nor torn with teeth.” Germans’ lips be not so far asunder, but ye may easily join them together by such constructions.

But Chrysostom saith in like wise: *Dentes inserimus in carnes Christi:* “We thrust our teeth into the flesh of

Augustin. ad
eodem libro.
[ibid.]

Cyprian. de
Cena Dom.
[*i. Chrysost.*
ex variis locis
in Matt. hom.
9. li. 992. ed.
1588.]

De Con. dist.
2. Ego Be-
reng. In
Glossa.

Chrysost. in
Enceniis.
[ed. 1588.
tom. lii. 821.]

Christ." Oh, M. Harding, you cannot be ignorant of Chrysostom's extraordinary and vehement manner of speech: and therefore ye are the more to blame, thus of purpose and wittingly to abuse your reader. For as Chrysostom saith: "*We thrust our teeth into Christ's flesh:*" so he saith likewise, "*Christ is slain upon the communion table, and his blood is poured from his side.*" Likewise he saith

Chrysost. ad
Rom. hom. 2.
[leg. 21. tom.
ix. 679.]

Hieron. in
Jobum, cap.
19.

Cyprian.
[Arnold.] de
Cæna Dom.
[app. cxiv.]

unto a slanderer of his neighbour: *Linguae tuam humano sanguine rubefecisti*: "Thou hast dyed thy tongue red in man's blood." So St. Hierom saith: *Detractatores vivis carnis saturantur*: "Slanderers are filled with live flesh." So saith St. Cyprian: *Cruci hæremus: sanguinem sugimus: et intra ipsa Redemptoris nostri vulnera linguam figimus*: "We cleave to the cross: and suck the blood: and we fasten our tongues within the wounds of our Redeemer."

These and other like phrases, commonly used in the ancient fathers, may not be racked to the extremity of the words: but rather ought favourably to be applied to the meaning: which was, by the material tooth and tongue of the body, to express the spiritual and inward eating and sucking of the mind. So St. Augustine saith: *Figura ergo est, præcipiens passioni Domini communicandum, et suaviter atque utiliter recondendum in memoria, quod caro Christi crucifixa pro nobis, et vulnerata sit*: "Therefore it is a figure, or a figurative phrase of speech, commanding us to be partakers of Christ's passion, and comfortably and profitably to lay up in our hearts, that his flesh was crucified and wounded for our sakes."

Augustin. de
Doctrin.
Christian.
lib. 3. cap. 16.
[iii. §2.]

As for your consecration, *corpus quantum, non quantum, non per modum quanti, individuum vagum, &c.* which lately were the substantiallest points of all your doctrine, it is sufficient for you now to say, *They are no articles of your faith.* Such grace have you for advantage, to make your faith more, or less, at your pleasure. *Touching your dogs and mice, whether they eat the very body of Christ or no, and that substantially, verily, and indeed,* ye seem still to stay in doubt, as not yet being well assured of this Article of your faith. But this is a most certain and undoubted Article of our faith, that no creature can eat the body of

Christ, but he that is a member of Christ's body. St. Augustine saith: *Hoc est manducare illam escam, et illum potum bibere, in Christo manere, et Christum manentem in se habere*: "This is the eating of that meat, and the drinking of that drink: for a man to dwell in Christ, and to have Christ dwelling within him." And therefore we say, whosoever will hold, that a *dog* or a *mouse* may eat the very body of Christ, and that really and indeed, or whoso staggereth, or doubteth, whether it may be so or no, accursed be he.

You say, your contentions between your two contrary armies, the Thomists and the Scotists, and other schoolmen, stand only in certain *terms metaphysical*: as *utrum ens, et unum differant ratione, an reipsa*: the truth whereof is very agreeable to the rest of your doctrine. For, to leave a whole world of the endless contentions that are among you, Alphonsus, one of your own doctors, saith, that one of your Thomists doubted not to pronounce openly in the behoof of his master: *Quisquis a B. Thomæ sententia discesserit, suspectus de hæresi est censendus*: "Whosoever forsaketh the judgment of Thomas of Aquine, must be taken, as suspected of heresy." I think, ye use not to place your heresies in *terms metaphysical*.

Erasmus, that lived in that age, and well understood of the furies of your schools, saith thus: *Qui Thomam sequuntur, et a Scoto, et a Gersono dissentiunt, eos [leg. cosque] pene habent pro hereticis*: "They that follow Thomas, and dissent from Duns and Gerson, account them in a manner as good as heretics."

Dominicus a Soto, and Catharinus were both learned men: both of your side: both sworn to the pope: both present at your late chapter of Trident. Yet thus doth the one of them greet the other: *Tu permanes [l. perdurus] in sensu damnato per synodum*: "Thou remainest still in a sense condemned by the council." Catharinus condemneth cardinal Cajetan for two hundred sundry errors: and some of them he calleth *wicked and antichristian*. These *terms* must needs be very *metaphysical*, M. Harding, that can yield you such *heretical and antichristian errors*.

Augustin. in
Johan. tract.
26. [iii. pt. 2.
501.]

Alphons. de
Hæresib. lib.
1. cap. 7. [p.
38.]

Erasm. con-
tra Lato-
num. [opp.
tom. ix. p.
85.]

Dominicus a
Soto contra
Catharinum.
[cap. 2. p.
239.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 6. Divis. 1.

They were best therefore to go, and set peace at ^[Vol. iv. p. 32.] home rather among themselves. Of a truth, *unity* and *concord* doth best become religion: yet is not *unity* the sure and certain mark, whereby to know the church of God. For there was the greatest *unity* that might be, amongst them, that worshipped the golden calf, and among them, which with one voice jointly cried against our Saviour Jesus Christ, "Crucify him." Neither, because the Corinthians were unquieted with private dissensions: or because Paul did square with Peter, or Barnabas with Paul: or because the Christians, upon the very beginning of the gospel, were at mutual discord touching some one matter or other, may we therefore think, there was no church of God amongst them. And for those persons, whom they upon spite call Zwinglians and Lutherans, in very deed they of both sides be Christians, good friends, and brethren. They vary not betwixt themselves upon the principles and foundations of our religion, nor as touching God, or Christ, or the Holy Ghost, or the means of justification, or of everlasting life, but upon one only question, which is neither weighty, nor great: neither mistrust we, or make doubt at all, but they will shortly be agreed. And if there be any of them, which have other opinion than is meet, we doubt not, but ere it be long, they will put apart all affections and names of parties, and that God will reveal the truth unto them: so that, by better considering and searching out of the matter, as once it came to pass in the council of Chalcedon, all causes and seeds of dissension shall be thoroughly plucked up by the

root, and be burned, and quite forgotten for ever.
Which God grant.

M. HARDING.

These defenders be like in conditions to such honest women, as commonly we call scolds.....Because *unity* pleaseth you not, as being that through lack whereof your new church is of all good men detested, and of the meanest very much suspected, ye say, it is not a sure and a certain mark, whereby to know the church of God. Yes, masters, among other notes and marks of the true church, *unity* is one: not every *unity*, but *unity* in the Holy Ghost, which giveth life to that one body the church, whereof every faithful is a member, and Christ the head, and pouring charity abroad in our hearts, so linketh all right believers together in the bond of peace, as they all say one thing, think one thing, savour one thing. The *unity* that is the note and mark of the true church, whereof we speak, is that for which the church is called one, and being gathered and knit together, professeth *unity* of faith, of good will and mutual love together, and of sacraments. The *unity* of them who worshipped the golden calf, and with one consent against our Saviour cried, "Crucifige," was far distant from the *unity* which is a note of the church, and is the work of the Holy Ghost. Such is the *unity* of the devils, who conspire against Christ and all his with one consent. Such *unity* is oftentimes in thieves. Such *unity* is found in you, and all your sects. For be ye never so divers, and at variance within yourselves, yet ye join together in wicked amity and *unity* against the church of Christ. And therefore St. Augustine compareth you, and all such as ye be, to Samson's foxes, that were sundred by the heads, and tied together by the tails.

Neither say we, that among them who vary in small points, and things not pertaining to the grounds of faith, there is no church. For all that certain of the Corinthians in the primitive church were at square: howsoever Paul told Peter that he thought good: though Barnabas and Paul agreed not about John Mark, yet were they of Christ's church: what else? But where ye bring this for excuse of the Lutherans and the Zwinglians, and other sects sprung out of them, the cause is not like pardy. For say on what ye list, and lie so long as ye list, their dissensions cannot be dissembled: much less can they be accorded, &c.

Yet lest they, whose fortune is not to see ought thereof written elsewhere, should mistrust my report, as all do espy your lying: the words of Nicolaus Gallus, your own doctor of Luther's school, here I will rehearse: *Non sunt leves inter nos concertationes de rebus levibus, sed de sublimibus doctrinæ Christianæ articulis, de lege et evangelio, de justificatione, et bonis operibus, de sacramentis, &c.*: "The strifes," saith he, "that be amongst us be not light, nor of light matters, but of the high articles of Christian

JEWEL, VOL. V.

X

1 Cor. i. 11.
Galat. ii. 11.
Acts xv. 2.

In Thesibus
et Hypotypo-
sibus, fol. ult.

doctrine, namely, of the law and of the gospel, of justification, and of good works, of the sacraments," &c. Here, as ye see, he reckoneth up a great many of the weightiest points of our religion, whereof they dissent among themselves. But I doubt what I may call weighty and great, seeing these good fellows call the controversy which is betwixt the Lutherans and the Zwinglians, concerning the body of our Saviour Christ, neither weighty, nor great. But as they make a foul lie therein, so do they also in saying, they vary not betwixt themselves, but upon one only question. Of the dissension that is between the Lutherans and Zwinglians, thus pitifully complaineth Nicolaus Amsdorfius in his book entitled, *Publica Confessio puræ Doctrinæ*, himself being an earnest Lutheran: "The world goeth with us worse and worse daily. All things do prognosticate the utter ruin of the gospel: and that in place of the gospel we shall have nothing but mere errors, and the same very notable." (Then after a few words) "Now Brentius," saith he, "and the Adia-phorists" (they be a special sect of the Lutherans), "being at the communication or conference at Worms, would not condemn Zwinglius and Osiander, because they were trim men in the tongues, and well seen in humanity. And as for us and our side, because we refused to agree unto that communication unless they were condemned, they dressed us vilely with their scoffs and railings, thrust us out of the communication, and compelled us to go away," &c. Item after a few:

"There be that say they condemn Zwinglianism: but the preface of Brentius to master James the minister of Goppingen his book, witnesseth far otherwise. For there they go about" (a God's name) "to conciliate good father Luther and Zwinglius, and make them friends one with another: *Quod plane impossibile est: quis enim unquam audivit contradictoria posse redigi in concordiam?* 'Which is impossible: for who ever heard that contradictions may be accorded?'" (But the masters of the Apology make no doubt at all, but they will shortly be agreed.) "Such childish and impossible things they stick not to set forth, who would be counted the teachers of the world, as though we were but blocks and asses. But as for the heresies and errors of Zwinglius and Osiander, with a quiet conscience we cannot embrace. Neither can we subscribe and yield to their departing away, and new gewgaws, which have divided themselves from Luther." Thus far Amsdorfius, and much more there to the same purpose, which here I leave to blot the paper withal. To conclude, thus all men may plainly see how the masters of this Defence be convinced of foul lying by their own doctors and school-fellows, beside the thing itself that giveth manifest evidence against them. But such stuff in their writings and preachings is not geasone⁷³. Leaving others, I report me to M. Jewel's

[⁷³ "geasone," i. e. shrunk, scanty. See Jamieson's Etymol. Dict. Supplem.]

late sermon made at Paul's Cross on the Sunday before Ascension-day last, in which (if uniform report made by sundry there present be true) he abused certain honourable and many worshipful personages, and of common people a great multitude, with lies worthy rather to be chastised by laws, than to be confuted with words. But be it as it is written: *Qui in sordibus est, sordescat adhuc.*

Rev. xxii. 11.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

It pitieth me, M. Harding, to see your trifling. If ye thought it so good skill, for advantage of your cause, to compare us to scolds, wherefore then did not you, although not through your whole book, yet at least in this selfsame place, where ye so deeply charge us with scolding, refrain better from such wild speeches, as might seem to prove yourself a scold? For, I beseech you, call your words a little to remembrance: and consider indifferently what women they be that commonly use the like. Thus ye say: "Even so, good sirs, proudly, wickedly, and fondly ye object: ye shew your clerkly prowess: ye brag: ye boast: now have you told your scolding tale: ye join in wicked amity against the church of Christ: the founders of your church: the apostles of your gospel: ye are convinced of foul lying: all men do espy your lying: lie on so long as ye list: he that is filthy, let him be filthy still." These be your words, M. Harding, all together in one place. If you can find so many the like in all our whole Apology, condemn us hardly, and call us *scolds*.

Unity we love, and honour it as the greatest comfort of Christian hearts. But if *unity* be the only and undoubted token of the church of God, woe then be to you, and to your fellows. For by that token, agreeing so ill amongst yourselves, ye should seem to have no church.

But, as we have said, all they that agree together are not therefore evermore of the church. Herod and Pilate were made friends, and agreed together. David saith: "The kings and princes of the earth have met and agreed together against the Lord, and against his Christ." St. John saith of the friends and favourers of Antichrist: *Hi unum consilium habent, et vires ac potestatem suam tradent bestiæ: hi pugnabunt cum Agno*: "These shall have all one counsel

Luke xxiii.
12.

Psal. ii. 2.

Rev. xvii. 13.

(and one mind) : and shall deliver over their strength and their power unto the beast : and shall fight against the Lamb.”

Chrysost. in
Matt. hom.
29. in Opere
imperfect.
[vi. app. 123.]

Chrysostom saith : *Expedit et ipsis dæmonibus obaudire sibi invicem in schismate* [al. *schemate*] : “It is good even for the devils themselves to be obedient one of them unto another in their division.” Symmachus, and other like maintainers of the heathenish idolatry, said : *Æquum est, quicquid omnes colunt, unum putari* : “It is meet that whatsoever all men worship, be counted *one*.” And thus the heathens and infidels would they seem to hold by *unity*.

Ambros. lib.
5. epist. 30.
[leg. Sym-
machi. ii.
830.]

John x. 27.

If your *unity*, M. Harding, be so sound and so certain, as ye would seem to make it, why then do you condemn yourselves one another of *heresy*? Certainly *heresy* importeth *division*, and not great *unity*. The whole show and substance of your *unity* standeth in this : To give ear to yourselves, and to put Christ to silence. But the true and *Christian unity* is this : That the whole flock of Christ hear the voice of the only Shepherd, and follow him. The band of *unity* is simple *verity* : which, M. Harding, forasmuch as ye have forsaken, ye have no great cause to talk much of *unity*.

As for Samson’s *fox-tails*, it seemeth ye lacked somewhat to play withal. Otherwise they serve you here to no great purpose. For if there be any dissension amongst us, it is not in any Article of the faith, but only in some particular point of learning. The like whereof hath been between St. Augustine and St. Hierom, and others the learned, godly, and catholic fathers of the church. And thus, contrary to Samson’s *foxes*, notwithstanding one or other have been divided in some certain conclusion, as it were in the tails, yet we join thoroughly all together in one head, in one gospel, in one way of salvation, and in one sum of religion : and all together, with one mouth, and one spirit, we glorify God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Concerning the disagreement, that is between the Lutherans and the Zwinglians, touching the *being of the body of*

Christ in one only place, or in many, we say, that in respect either of salvation, or of other Article, of God the Father, or of the Son, or of the Holy Ghost, or of any other the grounds and principles of the Christian faith, it is not weighty. In that respect we speak it only. Otherwise we say, the error is weighty. Such errors in sundry the ancient fathers have been dissembled, and past in silence.

St. Hilary seemeth to say : " That Christ received not flesh of the blessed Virgin : " and, " That the same flesh of Christ was impassible, and could feel no grief⁷⁴. " Hilar. de Trinitate, lib. 10. [p. 1066.] Hominis habitus est : Origo non hominis.

Origen saith : *Quidam putant Christum in futuro sæculo iterum pati oportere*, &c. : " Some men think that in the world to come *Christ must suffer in his body, or be crucified again*⁷⁵. " Brentius seemeth to hold, that Christ's body is infinite, and in all places, as is the Godhead : which error, it seemeth, was defended by some in St. Augustine's time. Naturam non habens ad dolendum. Origen. ad Rom. cap. 6. lib. 5. [iv. 568.] Brentius.

And therefore he saith : *Cavendum est, ne ita divinitatem astruamus hominis, ut veritatem corporis auferamus* : " We must take heed we do not so maintain the divine nature of Christ, being man, *that we take away the truth of his body*. " Augustin. epist. 57. ad Dardan. [ii. 681.]

These errors, notwithstanding they were great in themselves, yet in respect of other greater errors, have been dissembled. And therefore Jacob Andreas, albeit he could not be ignorant of this dissension, being himself a party to the same, yet he saith : *Quod vociferantur, nostros de summa evangelii nondum consentire, mendacium est* : " Whereas they cry out, " as M. Harding doth, " that we cannot agree among ourselves about the substance of the gospel, it is a very great untruth. " Jacob. Andreæ de Authoritat. Scripturæ, p. 178.

But you say : " The masters of the Apology tell us, they doubt not but these parties will be reconciled. And yet Nicolaus Amsdorfius " (with whose words ye are ashamed

⁷⁴ S. Hilar. "... quia et habitu ut homo repertus, habens in se doloris corpus, sed non habens naturam dolendi, dum et ut hominis habitus est, et origo non hominis est." Possibly, however, bishop Jewel may have had also the following passage in

view, "... habens ad patiendum quidem corpus, et passus est, sed naturam non habens ad dolendum." Hil. X. de Trinit. p. 1052. ⁷⁵ [Origen. The passage is rather paraphrased, than literally quoted.]

to blot your paper) "taketh the matter to be impossible." And here ye think ye have driven us near the wall, specially finding us so far disagreeing in judgment from a doctor, as you call him, of our own.

But, M. Harding, ye might better have considered, that Amsdorffius and we speak of sundry matters, and therefore our sayings may well stand together.

Amsdorffius saith, the *doctrine* and *terms* standing still, as they do, it is not possible by any manner of construction, to make the parties agree. But our trust in God is, that they that are deceived shall find their own error, and alter their *terms*, and correct their judgments, and submit themselves unto the truth, and so join together all in one.

So St. Augustine saith: *Recte dicitur, glaciale nivem calidam esse non posse. Nullo enim pacto, quam diu nix est, calida esse potest*: "It is well said, snow frorne or congealed can never be hot. For as long as it is snow, it is not possible to make it hot." And yet the liquor that now is frorne, may afterward be resolved, and made hot.

Augustin. in
Secunda Dis-
putat. contra
Fortunatum.
[viii. 104.]

So likewise he saith of the *heretics* named the Manichees: *Sic delirant Manichæi: sed resipiscant, et non sint Manichæi*: "Thus fond are the Manichees: but let them amend their errors, and no more be Manichees."

Mal. iv. 6.

What is there so contrary in judgment, as a Jew, and a Christian? Yet God hath promised, "That he will turn the hearts of the fathers" (the Jews) "unto their children: and the hearts of the children" (the Christians)

Rom. xi. 23.

"unto their fathers." And St. Paul saith: *Judæi, si non permanserint in incredulitate, inserentur. Potens enim est Deus iterum inserere eos*: "The Jews shall be grafted into the tree, if they abide not in unbelief. For God is able to graft them in again." What is there so contrary as *light*

Psal. xvii. 26.

and *darkness*? Yet the prophet saith: *Illumina tenebras meas*: "O Lord, lighten thou my darkness." To conclude, what is so contrary, as the kingdom of the *pope*, and the kingdom of *Christ*? And yet, we trust, it is not impossible, but the pope himself may once turn to God, and confess his errors, and profess the gospel of Christ, that he now oppresseth.

These things considered, M. Harding, it was no deadly sin, to say, we trust, that these matters of variance between the Lutherans and the Zwinglians will once be accorded : and that all causes and seeds of dissension shall be thoroughly pulled up by the roots, and be buried, and quite forgotten for ever. This change God hath already begun to work, not only in sundry learned men, but also in great cities, in good universities, and in whole countries. Therefore, we trust, our hope is not in vain.

“As for the lies, which” (it liketh you well to say) “M. Jewel made openly at Paul’s Cross,” I doubt not of your modesty, but ye would have blased them better, if ye had thought them worth your colours. Such general and so great exclamations, upon so simple reports, stand not always with greatest wisdom. He is too rash to be a judge, that pronounceth before he know the cause. What I said there, forasmuch as ye touch nothing in particular, it is needless to make rehearsal. But well I remember, I might truly have said, M. Harding commonly *misallegeth, misreporteth, misconstrueth, corrupteth, wresteth, and falsifieth* the ancient councils and holy fathers. I could have said, M. Harding is oftentimes directly contrary to himself. I could have said, M. Harding in one book hath uttered two hundred five and fifty great untruths. These, M. Harding, your conscience knoweth, *had been no lies : and therefore not meet to be chastised by any laws.*

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 7. *Divis. 1 and 2.*

But this is the heaviest and most grievous part of their slanders, that they call us wicked and ungodly men, and say we have thrown away all care of religion. Though this ought not to trouble us much, whilst they themselves, that thus have charged us, know full well, how spiteful and untrue their slander is. Justin the martyr is a witness, that all Christians were called *ἄθεοι*, that is, a “godless people,” as soon as the gospel first began to be pub-

[Vol. iv. p. 33.]

[Just. Mart. Apol. i. p. 47.]

lished, and the name of Christ to be openly declared. And when Polycarpus stood to be judged, the people stirred up the president to slay and murder all them which professed the gospel, with these words, Αἶρε τοὺς ἀθέους, that is to say, “Rid out of the way these wicked and godless creatures.” And this was, not because it was true, that the Christians were *godless* indeed, but because they would not worship stones and stocks, which were then honoured as God. The whole world seeth plainly enough already, what we and ours have endured at these men’s hands for religion, and our only God’s cause. They have thrown us into prison, into water, into fire, and have embued themselves in our blood : not because we were either adulterers, or robbers, or murderers, but only for that we confessed the gospel of Jesus Christ, and put our confidence in the living God : and for that we complained too justly and truly (Lord, thou knowest), that they did break the law of God for their own most vain *traditions* : and that our adversaries were the very foes to the gospel, and enemies to Christ’s cross, so wittingly, and willingly, and obstinately despising God’s commandments.

Wherefore, when these men saw they could not rightly find fault with our doctrine, they would needs pick a quarrel, and inveigh and rail against our manners, surmising, that we do condemn all well doings : that we set open the door to all licentiousness and lust, and lead away the people from all love of virtue. And in very deed, the life of all men, even of the devoutest and most Christian, both is, and evermore hath been such, as one may always find some lack, even in the very best and purest conversation. And such is the inclination of all

[Euseb. Hist.
Eccl. lib. iv.
cap. 15.]

creatures unto evil, and the readiness of all men to suspect, that the things, which neither have been done, nor once were meant to be done, yet may be easily both heard, and credited to be true. And like as a small spot is soon espied in the neatest and whitest garment, even so the least stain of dishonesty is easily found out in the purest and sincerest life. Neither take we all them, which have at this day embraced the doctrine of the gospel, to be angels, and to live clearly without any mote or wrinkle: nor yet think we these men neither so blind, that if any thing may be noted in us, they are not able to perceive the same even through the least crevy: nor so friendly, that they will construe ought to the best: nor yet so honest of nature, or courteous, that they will look back upon themselves, and weigh our lives by their own. If so be we list to search this matter from the bottom, we know, that in the very apostles' times there were Christians, through whom the name of the Lord was blasphemed and evil spoken of among the Gentiles. Constantius the emperor bewaileth, as it is written in Sozomenus, that many waxed worse and worse, after they had fallen to the religion of Christ. And Cyprian in a lamentable oration setteth out the corrupt manners of his time: "The wholesome discipline," saith he, "which the apostles left unto us, hath idleness and long rest now utterly marred....., every one studied to increase his livelihood: and clean forgetting, either what they had done before whilst they were under the apostles, or what they ought continually to do having received the faith: they earnestly laboured to make great their own wealth with an unsatiable desire of covetousness. There is no de-

[Cyprian.
de lapsis.
p. 183]

vout religion," saith he, "in priests, no sound faith in ministers, no charity shewed in good works, no form of godliness in their conditions: men are become effeminate⁷⁶, and women's beauty is counterfeited⁷⁷." And without reciting of many mo writers, Gregory Nazianzen speaketh thus of the pitiful state of his own time: "We," saith he, "are in hatred among the heathen for our own vices' sake: we are also become now a wonder, not only to angels and men, but even to all the ungodly." In this case was the church of God, when the gospel first began to shine, and when the fury of tyrants was not as yet cooled, nor the sword taken off from the Christians' necks. Surely it is no new thing, that men be but men, although they be called by the name of Christians.

M. HARDING.

Lo a grievous and a heavy case, that the world calleth you wicked and ungodly men, I wis they be to blame for it. And so be they, that call them thieves, which come to be promoted to Tyburne. For, God knoweth, little have you deserved so to be called, &c.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

All this, with the rest, is only Hick Scorners' eloquence, not worthy of answer.

⁷⁶ ["Corrupta barba in viris."] "*Tertullianus, O miseros, inquit,*
⁷⁷ [It is remarkable, that the translator here omits the following sentence, "*Et ante illum*
 "*nos qui Christiani dicimur hoc tempore.—Gentes agimus sub nomine Christi.*"]

Here endeth the Third Part.

THE FOURTH PART.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 1. Divis. 1.*

BUT will these men, I pray you, think nothing at all of themselves, whilst they so maliciously accuse us? And having leisure to behold so far off, and to see, what is done both in Germany and in England, have they either forgotten, or can they not see, what is done at Rome? or, will they accuse us, their own life being such, as no man is able to make mention thereof but with shame? Our purpose here is, not to take in hand at this present, to bring to light and open to the world those things, which were meet rather to be hid and buried with the workers of them. It beseemeth neither our religion, nor our modesty, nor our shamefastness. But yet he, which giveth commandment that he should be called the *vicar of Christ*, and *the head of the church*, who also heareth that such things be done in Rome, who seeth them, who suffereth them, (for we will go no further,) may easily consider with himself, what manner of things they be. Let him in God's name call to mind, and let him remember, that they be of his own *canonists* and *school doctors*⁷⁸, which

Johan. de
Magistris de
temperantia.

⁷⁸ [In the Latin, and in the edition of the Defence of 1567, there is nothing to answer to "school doctors." These words were add-

ed in the edition of 1570, in order to meet Harding's cavils in his Detection.]

have taught the people, that fornication between single folk is no sin : (as though they had fetched that doctrine from Mitio in Terence, whose words be : "It is no sin, believe me, for a young man to haunt harlots.") Let him remember, they be of his own, which have decreed, that a priest ought not to be put out of his cure for fornication⁷⁹. Let him remember also, how cardinal Campegius⁸⁰, Albertus Pighius, and others many mo of his own, have taught, that the priest, which *keepeth a concubine*, doth live more holily and chastely, than he *which hath a wife in matrimony*. I trust, he hath not yet forgotten, that there be many thousands of *common harlots* in Rome : and that he himself doth gather yearly of the same harlots above thirty thousand ducats, by the way of an annual pension. Neither can he forget, that he himself doth maintain openly *brothel houses*, and by a most filthy lucre doth filthily and lewdly serve his own lust. Were all things then pure and holy in Rome, when Joan *a woman*, rather of perfect age than of perfect life, was *pope* there, and bare herself as the *head of the church* : and after that, for two whole years, in that holy see she had played the naughty pack, at last, going in procession about the city, in the sight of all her cardinals and bishops, fell in travail openly in the streets ?

M. HARDING.

a By the answer it will appear, that this lie is plain truth.

...First, who seeth not^a, what a notorious lie they make in the preface and entry to the matter ? say they not, they take not upon them at this time to bring to light and to the show of the world those doings, which ought rather, together with the au-

⁷⁹ [2 qu. 7. Lator. in Margin. Supra vol. iv. p. 616.]

⁸⁰ [Campegius. All that he appears to say, if the work intended is that "de Cœlibat. Sacerd. non

abrogando," is that continence is better than wedlock, even if the man, who has vowed, is unwilling or unable to keep his vow, cap. 52.]

thors of them, to be buried? and that so to do, their religion, their shamefastness, their blushing doth not bear it? what is a lie, if this be not? do they not in deed, that they deny in word? yea, say they not that thing, which they affirm they say not?....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

I doubt not, good reader, but perusing these few following, thou shalt plainly see, that the authors of this Apology spake not all that they might well have spoken. But if thou happen to read Dantes, Petrarcha, Boccace, Mantuan, Valla, and others like, the pope's own dearlings, thou wilt certainly say, that even now, being thus challenged and called forth, and required to speak, yet we have rather given an inkling thereof, than opened the particular secrets of the matter. For thereof St. Bernard saith thus: *Quæ Bernard. ad*
in occulto fiunt ab episcopis, turpe est vel dicere: "It is *Clerum, in*
shame to utter the things, that bishops do in their secrets⁸¹." *Synodo Rhe-*
And thereof he saith further, even as did the writer of the *men. [Mansi*
Apology: *Melius itaque arbitror super hoc dissimulare:* *Eodem loco.*
"Touching such matters, I think it better to dissemble." *Fran. Petrar.*
Franciscus Petrarcha calleth Rome the *whore of Babylon*, *epist. 20.*
the *mother of all idolatry and fornication*: and saith, "*that* *Fran. Petrar.*
all shame and reverence is quite departed thence." Baptista *Cantilena 92.*
Mantuanus saith: *Onde fugita*
ogni vergogna.

*VIVERE QUI SANCTE CUPITIS, DISCEDITE ROMA*⁸²:

OMNIA CUM LICEANT, NON LICET ESSE BONUM.

"All ye that would live godly, be packing from Rome: for there all things else are lawful: but to be good it is not lawful." And again, as it is alleged once before⁸³:

SANCTUS AGER SCURRIS, VENERABILIS ARA CINÆDIS

SERVIT, HONORANDÆ DIVUM GANYMEDIBUS ÆDES.

Hereby, M. Harding, ye may easily see, that we of purpose dissembled, and covered your shame, and spake much less, and far otherwise of you, than we might have spoken. *Erasmus in*
vita Augus-
tini. [leg. in
Epist. ad
Arch. Tolet.
inter August.
opp. ed. Ba-
sil. 1528, tom.
i. p. 9.]

Erasmus, writing of St. Augustine's dealing against the Manichees, saith thus: *Obscæna mysteria Manichæorum*
protraxit in lucem. Nam hæc prodidisse, erat vicisse:

⁸¹ [Supra vol. iv. p. 482, note 35.]
⁸³ [Vol. iv. p. 616.]

⁸² [*al.* discedite: Romæ,

Bapt. Mantuan. [Syllvar. lib. 1. fol. clxviii.]

"He opened and published the filthy mysteries of the Manichees. For the very opening thereof was sufficient to overthrow them." But happy are they, that live in such sort, that no man may well reveal their life without blushing.

Here, M. Harding, ye charge us plentifully with *fables, and slanders, and heaps of lies, great, foul, lewd, and shameful*, in one company, all together. Wherein it was no great mastery for you to be so liberal: for that hereof ye want no store.

But if we shall be able clearly and plainly to avouch and justify each thing, that we have spoken, then we doubt not, but ye will take all those *lies* home again, and bestow them freely among yourselves.

M. HARDING.

"They be the pope's canonists," say they, "that have taught the people that simple fornication is no sin." A grievous offence, and worthy to be punished. And verily if any pope ever knew, that his learned men in the canon law have taught the people such heathenish and devilish doctrine, ^athough no man in earth be his judge, yet he may be thought unworthy the room of so great charge. But if the pope never knew such doctrine preached by the canonists, and if at no time there have been any such, then is he clear, and ye are proved slanderers, and false backbiters. We deny it utterly. How prove ye it? "Marry sir," say ye, "look in the margin of our Apology, and there shall ye find one John de Magistris, noted for an offender in that behalf." Well, if it were so, he was but one man: ye speak of *canonists*, which word signifieth a number. And how prove ye, that he the said John de Magistris (for now I will spare you, and will not say *they*) taught the people that simple fornication was no sin? &c.

Crimes laid to the pope's charge by the defenders.

a Untruth. For the canonists themselves confess, that the council may judge, and depose the pope.

Now we tell you, that we cannot find, where ever Johannes de Magistris wrote so impiously as ye report. Is it not Martinus de Magistris that ye mean? It is a great rashness, if ye have not read it yourselves, to believe such ^bpelting writers, that be of your sects, as ye do, by whom ye seem to be most shamefully and most dangerously deceived, &c. What will be thought and said of you, if we shew plainly, that ye have forged a foul lie, and a most false slander upon Martinus de Magistris? For so will we call him, until ye prove it of Johannes.

b This pelting writer is Alphonsus de Castro, one of M. Harding's greatest doctors.

This Martinus de Magistris was no canonist, as ye say, but a Johannes de doctor of divinity, well learned for his time and order of study as a schoolman. In a treatise that he made, *De Temperantia et de Luxuria*, he disputeth after such manner, as the scholastical doctors commonly use. Wherefore he that saith that he taught

Johannes de Magistris blamed by the defenders for Martinus de Magistris.

the people, sought by untruth how to make the matter more detestable. ^c For disputing in schools, and teaching the people be far asunder. Saith this doctor Martin after the guise of schools, *Queritur utrum simplex fornicatio sit peccatum mortale*, that is to say, "It is a question, whether simple fornication be mortal sin." ^e He that teacheth in schools is teacher of teachers.

^d This defender knew what he did, when he left out the word *mortal*. For being disposed to lie, he thought best to lie for a ^d Note by the way, that by M. Harding's secret conclusion, fornication is not a mortal, but a venial sin. vantage. Now this is to be understood, how the manner of the scholastical doctors is, first to propound a question: next to argue, object, and reason against the truth of the question: then to avouch and prove the truth: after that to soile ⁸³ the objections brought against the truth: lastly to bring conclusions for confirmation of the truth. Then in prosecuting his question, *Arguitur quod non*, "I reason against it," saith he, "and argue it is not so." And there, after the school manner, he maketh an argument against the truth. Which argument whosoever taketh for his purpose, and alloweth it, admitteth that the doctor goeth against, and disproveth. After this he cometh to prove the truth. And there it followeth. *In oppositum. Simplex fornicatio excludit*, &c.: "To the contrary," saith he, "simple fornication excludeth from the kingdom of God: *ergo*, it is mortal sin." Then he saith further: "It is to be noted, that the ^e opinion of Thomas is, that simple fornication undoubtedly is mortal sin." Whosoever readeth further in Martinus, he shall find, after he hath well disputed *pro* and *con*, as they term it in schools, that is to say, for and against the truth, that he putteth six conclusions, of which the fourth beginneth thus: *Ideo*, &c.: "Therefore simple fornication is mortal sin, because it is forbidden by God's law," &c. And in the end of the sixth, he saith: "Hereof the falsehood of their opinion is made evident, who say, that simple fornication is not mortal sin." Which opinion is condemned in the Articles of them of Paris, *errore* clxxxvi. Then he saith further: "Guido the Carmelite saith in a chapter, *contra Errores Græcorum*, that the error of the Greeks, saying simple fornication between a single man and a single woman not to be mortal sin, openly containeth heresy against the holy scripture, and that he proveth by four reasons," &c. ^e *Ergo*, by likelihood the opinion of others was otherwise.

By this, and much more there expressed, it is sufficiently proved, that Martinus de Magistris, in his scholastical disputations in the said treatise, saith not that simple fornication is no sin: much less can it be reasonably, or with any colour of honesty said, that so he taught the people. And therefore it is falsely and slanderously imputed unto him..... ^{For trial of this conclusion, see the answer.}

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here ye say, "*we lie*:" "*we backbite*:" "*we slander*," &c. For answer hereunto, first we say, It is no new device,

⁸³ [To "soile;" i. e. to "solve." Thus to "assoil," i. e. absolve.]

A foul slanderous lie made by the defenders. The manner of the school doctors.

Martinus de Magistris cleared of the crime by the defenders objected.

to make light and simple account of your *simple fornication*. For Aëtius the old heretic used thus to say: *Dormire cum muliere extra conjugium, non magis est peccatum, quam aurem scalpere*: "To have the company of a woman out of marriage, is no more a sin, than it is for a man to claw his ear." Likewise the heretic Prodicus said: *Licet palam, et aperte fornicari*: "It is lawful to commit open fornication." Likewise not long sithence wrote Laurentius Valla, in earnest or in game I cannot tell: but thus he wrote: and he wrote it in Rome, being himself one of the canons there: *Omnino nihil interest, utrum cum marito coeat mulier, an cum amatore*: "Undoubtedly there is no difference, whether a woman keep company with her husband, or with her lover⁸⁴." Richardus de Sancto Victore saith: *Paulus praevidebat, multos fore, qui fornicationis malum non adeo damnabile putarent*: "St. Paul foresaw, there should be many, that would think *the ill of fornication not to be so damnable a matter*." To like purpose Socrates writeth of the corrupt judgment of sundry of his time: *Scortationem indifferentem esse putant: de festis vero diebus, perinde atque pro animabus suis dimicant, invertentes mandata Dei, &c.*: "They take *fornication or whoredom to be a thing indifferent*" (that is to say, neither good nor ill, but left at liberty): "but they fight for the keeping of their holy days, as for their souls." From these fathers, as it appeareth, issued out the pope, and his Roman clergy: who have learned so readily to swallow a camel, and so nicely and solemnly to strain a gnat.

But ye will say, "All this hitherto pertaineth nothing unto the canonists, specially in the plural number."

Let us therefore see the practice of the church of Rome, which is the life and soul of the canonists. Thus therefore it is noted in the Decrees: *Qui non habet uxorem, loco illius concubinam debet habere*: "He that hath not a *wife*, instead of her *must have a concubine*." Ye will say: "There is

Epiphani. lib. 3. hæres. 76. [i. 917.]

Clemens Stromat. lib. 3. [i. 525.]

Laurent. Valla, de Voluptate, lib. 1. cap. 38.

Rich. de Sancto Victore, pt. 2. fol. 73.

Socrat. lib. 5. cap. 21. [ii. 299.]

Dist. 34. Is qui. Paris. ann. 1505.

⁸⁴ [This work consists of a dialogue, in which Antonius an Epicurean plays a principal part. The sentence in the text is put into his mouth.]

error in the print⁸⁵." Be it so. Yet thus is it extant in many copies, and it is well agreeable to your common practice. For the best that you can make of the same place is this: *Is, qui non habet uxorem, et pro uxore concubinam habet, a communione non repellatur*: "He that hath no wife, and instead of a wife hath a concubine, let him not be removed from the communion."

Addition.

Addition. ☞ "Here is good gear, M. Jewel, for you to juggle withal. And how can it be, but that yourself do know, that you do impudently? You pervert the text: you misconstrue it: you leave out that goeth before, and that followeth immediately after :.....you dissemble the circumstance of the place, and omit the chapter that in Gratian goeth immediately before: in which chapter he declareth what in that place, and certain other there by him alleged, is meant by a *concubine*, saying: *Concubina hic intelligitur, quæ cessantibus legalibus instrumentis, unita est, et conjugali affectu asciscitur. Hanc conjugem facit affectus: concubinam vero lex nominat, &c.*: 'Yea the canons also do name such a woman a *concubine* sometimes, and not a *wife*, until the marriage be solemnized,' &c. In this sentence therefore he expoundeth, how the word *concubine* is to be taken in those canons, as much to say, for a *wife* privately taken, without public solemnization, &c. As soon as that writing was made, and public solemnity was performed, the children born before were accounted lawfully born, and the *concubine* to have been a *wife* from the beginning. And this woman the law nameth in the mean time a *concubine*, and not a *whore*," &c.

"She may be called a *concubine*, which indeed is a true wife before God, and so shall you find *concubina* used in the scripture." *The answer.* O, what ado have you made us here, M. Harding, in defence of your *concubines*! If the matter had been good, I doubt not, but you would have maintained it a great deal better. "A concubine," you say, "the solemnization only excepted, is taken for a very lawful wife:" and for proof hereof, you have

⁸⁵ [In later editions of the Decretum the false print has been corrected.]

398 b.

Dist. 34. Is
qui.With intent
of wedlock.

brought us scriptures, doctors, glosses, and canons : and all this, as it may be thought, in defence of your *priests' concubines*. “A concubine,” you say, “is a wife in affection, a wife before God, and a very wife indeed.” I marvel much at your strange commentaries, M. Harding. For your text is directly to the contrary. And here I bid you not overmuch to trouble your eyes, and to espy, either what goeth before, or what followeth after. In the very selfsame words that I have alleged, you may easily find difference between a *wife* and a *concubine*. For thus it is written : *Is qui uxorem non habet, et pro uxore habet concubinam, a communione non repellatur* : “He, that hath not a wife, but instead of a wife hath a *concubine*, let him not be put from the communion.” You say, *a wife and a concubine are both one thing*. But your book saith, Neither a *concubine* is a *wife*, nor a *wife* is a *concubine*. Mark well the words. Thus they stand : “He, that hath not a wife, but instead of a wife hath a *concubine*.” It were a very strange kind of speech, to say : “He, that hath not a wife, but instead of a wife hath a wife.” Yet thus must you needs say, if a *wife* and a *concubine* be both one thing. But all this is easily answered. For you say : “That a woman is a concubine, that is taken privately, and not married solemnly in the face of the church.” Fie, M. Harding, why should you thus vainly abuse your friends ? is this your meaning, that a *concubine* is married, although not solemnly and openly in the church ? who ever told you of such a marriage ? or how can you so suddenly forget yourself ? Be not these your own words, in this very same place : “A concubine is a woman kept at bed and at board, as a wife with intent of wedlock ?” If she be wedded already, how is she kept *with intent of wedlock* ? if she be not a *wife* indeed, how is she kept in bed and at board, as, or instead of, a *wife* ? Verily, M. Harding, a *concubine*, while she was a *concubine*, was never married : neither openly nor privately, as it shall appear : but afterward, being once married, she was no longer called a *concubine*.

And, that you may the better understand, how substantially ye have dealt in this case, it may please you to

know, that the law saith: *Concubinatus est inter solutum et solutam*: “*Concubinatus* is” (not between man and wife, but) “between a single man and a single woman.” And Single. he, that keepeth a *concubine*, is not in the law called *maritus*, but *amasius*: that is to say, “not a husband, but a Amasius. lover:” and the same *lover* might either refuse his *concu-* Forsake. *bine*, or be refused of her, when either of them would, ff. [Infort. lib. 26. lit. 7.] De Concubinis. without any divorce or other solemnity, at their pleasures. The children between them begotten, unless matrimony follow, are not *legitimate*, but live in *bastardy*. It is Bastardy. written: *Concubina æquiparatur uxori, affectu, non honore matrimonii*: “A *concubine* is compared with a wife in affection of love, but not in honour of matrimony.” A Affection. *concubine* may be received as a *witness* for her lover, but Witness. a wife may not be received as a witness for her husband. The very state, wherein they live, is called in the law, *crimen concubinatus*, that is, “the sin of that trade of life.” Sin. For the law presumeth, they cannot live honestly. And if any man defile another man’s *concubine*, he is not thought in law to commit *adultery*, neither can he that keepeth a No adultery. *concubine* enter an action against him that hath defiled her, unless he that keepeth her be his *patron* or his *lord*. I Nisi sit concubina patroni. dare not to note these places severally in the margin: for then, M. Harding, you would rebuke me, as your manner is, *for shewing my great skill in canon law.*

But now, I beseech you, what kind of marriage can you imagine to be *inter solutum et solutam*, that is to say, “between a *single man*, and a *single woman*?” if they be both *single*, how be they *married*? if they be *married*, how be they *single*? Or will you say, that a woman, *that never was married*: that may lawfully refuse her paramour when she will, and be lawfully refused of him at his pleasure: that liveth *without the honour of marriage*: that by presumption of law *cannot live honestly*: whose life is *infamous*: whose children are all in a state of *bastardy*: that may be defiled by any other wicked man without committing *adultery*: all these things notwithstanding, will you say, that such a woman is a *good and a lawful wife*? or will you bring us scriptures and doctors to prove the same?

If your mother had been such a wife, M. Harding, ye wiss you could not have been made a priest, without a special dispensation. Verily, as you say, "*A concubine is a lawful wife,*" so may you likewise say, *A lawful wife is a concubine.* To be short, if a *wife* and a *concubine* be both one thing, why doth the pope so easily allow a priest to keep a *concubine*, and so straitly forbid him to have a *wife*?

But you say: "I have foully corrupted mine author, and have purposely left out both that went before, and also that followed after in the same Distinction." Therefore let us better consider these words, both backward, and forward, and of every side. First, Gratian in the chapter going immediately before, as you yourself have alleged him, saith thus: *Concubina hic intelligitur, quæ, cessantibus legalibus instrumentis, unita est, et conjugali affectu asciscitur*: "Here a *concubine* is such a woman, as is coupled unto a man without lawful instruments, or solemnization of matrimony, and is taken with intent and affection of marriage." Mark well these words, M. Harding: "A

With intent
of marriage.

woman that is taken with intent and affection of marriage." These be your own words, although untruly and guilefully Englished. Notwithstanding, we will take them, as they be. If a *concubine* be taken with intent of marriage, then, I trow, as yet she is not married. For no wise man intendeth to do that thing, that is done already. Now if a *concubine* be not married, but only kept with intent to be married, I pray you, M. Harding, what may we call her?

Dist. 34. Is
qui: in Glos-
sa.

Certainly your doctors say: *Secundum canones semper præsumitur adulterium, nisi appareant legales solemnitates*: "Unless the solemnities of the law may appear, by the canon law it is ever presumed to be adultery," and therefore no marriage. Thus much for the chapter that went before. In the chapter immediately following, it is written thus: *Christiano non nisi unam tantum habere licet, aut uxorem, aut certe loco uxoris, si conjunx deest, concubinam*: "It is lawful for a Christian man to have only one woman, either his *wife*, or, instead of a *wife*, his *concubine*." Here a *concubine* is not a *wife*, but a woman taken instead of a *wife*. That your Gloss here telleth us of mutual consent, is

Dist. 34.
Christiano.

Instead of
a wife.

but a toy. For notwithstanding any manner *consent* that may be between them, a *concubine*, while she is a *concubine*, is not married : and being not married, she is no *wife*. Therefore St. Augustine saith, even as you have alleged him : *Etsi non habetis uxores, tamen non licet vobis habere concubinas, quas postea dimittatis* : “ Although you have no wives, yet is it not lawful for you to have concubines, whom ye may afterward put from you.” If *concubines* be nothing else but *wives*, why is it not lawful for men to have them? is it not lawful for Christian men to have wives? Yet your Rubric upon the same Distinction saith thus : *Qui non habet uxorem, loco illius concubinam habere licet* : give hereto the best English ye can devise. The words be plain : “ It is lawful for him, that hath no *wife*, instead of her to have a *concubine*.”

Augustin. lib. 50. Homil. hom. 49. [v. 1504.]

Dist. 34. Is qui. [in titul.]

But St. Augustine saith : *Dicit aliquis, Meretrix non est, quam habeo : concubina mea est* : “ Some man will say, The woman that I keep is not my harlot : she is my *concubine*.” Hereto St. Augustine answereth thus : *Bene : velis, nolis, illa, quæ præter uxorem tecum dormit, est meretrix* : “ Well, well : whether thou wilt, or wilt not, she, that sleepeth with thee besides thy wife, is thy harlot.” St. Hierom saith : *Thy harlot. Unde sine nuptiis aliud nomen uxorum ? Imo, unde novum concubinarum genus ? Plus inferam : Unde meretrices univiræ ? Eadem domo, uno cubiculo, sæpe uno tenentur et lectulo, &c.* : “ From whence have we another kind of wives without marriage? nay, from whence have we this new kind of concubines? I will say more, from whence have we whores betaken to one man? They live together in one house, in one chamber, and oftentimes in one bed.”

Augustin. de Tempore, serm. 164. [v. 969.]

Hieronym. ad Eustochium de Custodia Virginit. tom. 1. [iv. pt. 2. p. 33.]

Now, M. Harding, you tell us, that *concubina* is not a *whore*. But St. Augustine telleth you : *Velis, nolis, est meretrix* : “ Whether ye will, or nill, she is a *whore*.” And St. Hierom telleth you, that *concubina est meretrix univira* : “ that a *concubine* is a *whore* betaken to one man.” If *meretrix* be a *whore*, it is easy to English *concubina*.

These be foul matters, M. Harding : you cannot maintain them without some blemish of your credit. ☞

Likewise it is noted in the Gloss upon the Constitutions

Constit.
Othon. de
Concubinis
Clericor. re-
movend.
Licet ad pro-
fugandum,
In Glossa,
[p. 44 b.]

of Otho⁸⁶: *Videtur quod hoc crimen meretricii ecclesia sub dissimulatione transire debeat*: "It seemeth, that the church ought to pass over the *crime of whoredom under dissimulation*," (and not to see it.)⁸⁷ In which Gloss ye shall find these words: *Si non caste, tamen caute*: "If you do it not chastely, yet do it charily."

M. Harding,
fol. 399 b.

Addition. ☞ M. Harding. "As for those words, *si non caste, tamen caute*, they are there rehearsed as a common

Not as a rule.

saying, not as a rule or precept of the canon law, neither pertain they to clerks more than to the lay sort. The circumstance of the place considered and weighed, all things may seem there to be well and discreetly said. Of two that commit fornication, he doth less evil that doth it secretly, than the other that doth it openly, &c. How shall not that vulgar saying seem to give good counsel, *Si non caste, tamen caute*? whereby a man is not animated at all to do ill, but (if he hap to do his unclean lust, or will not be stayed from it) is admonished to do it charily, though not chastely." *The answer.* "These words," ye say, "pertain no more to clerks than to the lay sort." Here, M. Harding, ye much forget yourself. The very bare title of that Constitution will soon reprove you. Thus it is written: *De concubinis clericorum removendis*: "Of removing priests' concubines," not the *concubines* of others of the lay sort, as you have imagined. For of *laymen* and their *concubines*, there is not one word spoken in all that whole Constitution. Contrariwise a little before, in the same place you may find these words: *Clerici hujusmodi concubinas tenent communiter, apparatu honesto, nomine appellationis sororiarum*: "Priests commonly keep such concubines in honest apparel, under the name of their *sisters*." Of such *concubines*, M. Harding, and of none other, your book entreateth. But it may be lawful for you to make us large commentaries beside your text. Of your priests'

Good coun-
sel.

In eadem
Glossa.

⁸⁶ [In the ed. of 1567, bishop Jewel had by mistake inserted "Bonus," Otho Bonus: on which Harding (Detect. p. 398 b.) animadverts.]

⁸⁷ [In justice to the Glosser, should be added his own opinion to the contrary: "Dic tamen, quod hoc peccatum prosecui debet ut mortale." See Detect. 399 b.]

concubines, M. Harding, and of none other, your doctor saith : *Si non caste, tamen caute* : “ If they deal not chastely, yet let them deal charily.”

“ But this,” you say, “ was only a common saying, and not a rule.” And is not this sufficient, think you ? can you imagine, that the common speech of the people is nothing worth, or groweth of nothing ? “ *It was no rule,*” you say. But the world saw ye lived so, as if it had been your only *rule*. Verily by the testimony of all your own writers, the whole life of the clergy was out of *rule*. Howbeit, you tell us : “ The circumstance considered, all this may seem to be well and discreetly spoken.” For you say : “ If a man happen to do his unclean lust, he is thereby admonished to do it charily, though he do it not chastely. And this,” you say, “ is good counsel.” No doubt, M. Harding, good, and discreet, and fatherly counsel. But St. Paul’s *counsel* is much better : *Ad evitandum fornicationem unusquisque uxorem suam habeat : melius est nubere, quam uri* : “ For avoiding of fornication, let every man have his own wife : ” “ better it is to marry, than to burn in desires.” ➤

Likewise saith Petrus Ravennas, one of your notable canonists, upon the Decretals : *Quamvis tactus et oscula sunt præludia incontinentiæ in laicis, secus tamen est in clericis. Nam clericus præsumitur ista facere pro charitate, et bono zelo* : “ Notwithstanding handling and kissing in lay persons be the occasions or beginnings of incontinent behaviour, yet in priests it is far otherwise. For a priest is presumed to do these things of charity, and of good zeal.”

Likewise it is noted in your Gloss : *Si clericus amplectitur mulierem, (laicus) interpretabitur, quod causa benedicendi eam hoc faciat* : “ If a priest embrace a woman, a layman must judge of it thus, that he doth it to the intent to bless her.” Where also ye shall find this special note set out in the margin for the purpose : *Clericus amplectens mulierem, præsumitur bene agere* : “ A priest embracing a woman, is presumed to do well.”

These be your canonists : these be your schoolmasters : these be your doctors, M. Harding : thus they write, not

1 Cor. vii. 2.

Extra. de
Immunit.
Eccles. Petr.
Ravenn.

11. quest. 3.
Absit. In
Glossa.

Ibidem in
Margine.

only in the *singular*, but also in the *dual* and *plural* number. They would never so lightly have judged hereof, if they had thought your *simple fornication* had been sin.

Augustin. in
Enchiridio
ad Lauren.
cap. 80. [vi.
227.]

St. Augustine saith: *Clamor Sodomorum et Gomorrhæorum multiplicatus est: quia non solum jam apud eos non puniebantur illa flagitia, verum etiam publice, velut lege, frequentabantur*: "The cry of Sodom and Gomorrha is multiplied: for that such vices then, not only were not punished, but also were openly used, as it had been by the aid and authority of the law."

Concil. Basil.
session. 20.
[xxix. 102
d. e.]

Somewhat it must needs be, that in your late council of Basil enforced the bishops there to decree, that *fornication* should be sin. For unless some had thought the contrary, what should we have needed that new *decree*? or why should they so solemnly determine, that *fornication is sin*, unless some had said, *It is no sin*? Erasmus, a man of

Erasm. in
Enchiridio
milit. Christi.
cap. 14. [vol.
v. 46.]

a He meaneth
some of the
best of the
Roman cler-
gy.

singular learning and judgment, saith: "*Bona pars eorum, quos vulgus integros et incorruptos appellat,.....simplicem fornicationem, et moderatum voluptatis usum, ut leve commissum, neutiquam refugiant*": "A great many of them, whom the common sort taketh for good and godly men, not a whit abhor *simple fornication*, and a sober use of pleasure, reckoning it to be but a little petit fault." So saith Jacobus de Valentia: *Tam Judæi, quam Saraceni, et mali Christiani,.....ut detestabilem vitam suam excusent [l. astruant], et defendant, asserunt, Fornicationem simplicem esse licitam [l. non esse peccatum]*: "As well Jews, as Saracens, as also *ill Christian men*, to the intent to excuse and defend their wicked life, say, *Simple fornication may be lawfully used*."

Jacob. de
Valentia in
Psal. cxviii.
[fol. cclix.
col. 4.]

Anton. in
Sum. pt. 3.
titul. 12. cap.
2. §. 3.

So saith Antoninus, the archbishop of Florence: *Confutatur error dicentium, Simplicem fornicationem non esse peccatum*: "Hereby is reprov'd the error of them that say, *Simple fornication is no sin*."

Alexander
Halensis, pt.
3. quæst. 35.
mem. 5.

Ambrosius,
1 Tim. iv.

of disputation, doubteth not to allege the words of St. Ambrose⁸⁸ to this purpose: *Etiam si aliquis lubricum carnis patiat, sine dubio vapulabit: sed non peribit*: "If a man

⁸⁸ [The work quoted by Alexander of Hales is not genuine.]

suffer the frailty of the flesh, without doubt he shall be punished: *but perish he shall not.*"

Thus have you, M. Harding, not only what your *canonists*, but also what your *school doctors*, have taught and thought of *simple fornication*.

But there is noted in the *margin of the Apology*, Johannes de Magistris, instead of Martinus. And hereof have you made yourself a pleasant conquest. "We read not," you say, "these books ourselves: we believe such pelting writers of our sects: we are shamefully and dangerously deceived." Howbeit, M. Harding, I require but your indifferent judgment: speak uprightly. Wherefore is it more deadly sin for us to name *Johannes* instead of *Martinus*, than it was for you in this selfsame book to name *captain Josue* instead of the *prophet Osee*? or, for one of your brethren to allege *Hosius* for *Athanasius*? or, for doctor Stephen Gardiner instead of *Theophylactus* to allege *Theophilus*? Cicero allegeth *Ajax* instead of *Hector*: *Agamemnon* instead of *Ulysses*: *Eupolis* instead of *Aristophanes*. Aristotle allegeth *Calypso* instead of *Circe*. Your Gratian allegeth *Aniceus* for *Anicetus*: *Ambrosius* for *Augustinus*: and by your own confession, *Calixtus* for *Anacletus*. St. Chrysostom nameth *Abakkuk* for *Sophonias*: and *Agar* instead of *Sarah*⁸⁹. St. Mark allegeth *Abiathar* for *Abimelech*. St. Matthew nameth *Hieremias* for *Zacharias*.

It had been no great prejudice unto your cause, to have dissembled so small a matter, specially finding yourself so often guilty in the same. Your own *doctors* say: *Error in nomine non habet vitiare, modo constet de corpore*: "Error in name marreth not the matter, so the body or party be known."

"But this same Martinus," ye say, "never denied fornication to be deadly sin: but by express words affirmeth the contrary." For trial hereof it may please you to give some credit to Alphonsus de Castro, your own doctor. His words be these: *Græci, ut Guido illis impingit, dicunt,*

M. Harding, p. 46. [leg. p. 156.]

Read the bishop of Winchester unto N. Fecknam, p. 121. Vint. Con. Cantuar. lib. 3. De eucharistia.

M. Harding, p. 93.

Chrysostom. ad Rom. i.

Chrysostom. ad Galat. iv.

† Hieronym. in Marc. ii. [v. 893.]

Matt. xxvii. 9.

De Rescriptis, Significante, Abb. [Panorm. tom. i. fol. 83. col. 3.]

Alphonsus contra Hæres. lib. 4. Coitus. [p. 300.]

⁸⁹ [In the Ben. ed. of St. Chrysostom the mistakes alleged are not found in either of the works quoted.]

Simplicem fornicationem non esse peccatum. Martinus de Magistris in suo libro De Temperantia, quæstione secunda de luxuria, dicit, se fateri fornicationem simplicem esse peccatum mortale. Tamen dicit insuper, quod oppositum credere non sit hæreticum: quia, ut dicit, Testimonia scripturæ sacræ non sunt expressa: "The Greeks, as Guido chargeth them, say, That simple fornication is no sin. Martinus de Magistris in his book of Temperance, and in the second question, disputing of lechery, granteth indeed, that simple fornication is deadly sin. And yet he saith, It is no heresy to believe the contrary: for that, as he saith, The testimonies of the scriptures" (touching this matter) "are not plain." Here, M. Harding, ye have your own doctor's mind. Martinus saith: "It is no heresy to believe, that simple fornication is no sin." And this he saith even in the very same book that he hath written, De Temperantia. So dangerously, M. Harding, and so shamefully are we deceived in alleging your petting doctors.

And therefore Alphonsus concludeth thus: *Sed cum pace illius dixerim, ego credo Martinum, alioqui virum doctum, in hac parte errasse:* "But to speak with his favour, I believe, that Martinus de Magistris in this behalf was much deceived."

M. HARDING.

a Untruth.
For this lie
will soon be
found a
truth.

b Who bestowed these
quotations in
the margin,
I cannot tell.
But the laws
are plain, as
it shall appear.

c This was in
old times.
Now it is
quite forgotten.

After this foul lie followeth ^a another. "Let him remember," say these defenders, "that they be his men, that have decreed, that a priest for fornication ought not to be removed from his cure." To this we may say, that although he be not deprived of his cure, yet he may be punished otherwise. But let us see, how they would prove that they say. ^b By their note in the margin they send us for proof to the canon law, 3. *quest. 7. Lata. Extra de Bigamis. Quia circa.* As touching the chapter, *Lata*⁹⁰, in the decrees we find none such. And in *causa 3. quest. 7.* there is nothing to this purpose. The paragraph *Quia circa. Extra.* is understood of them, who being in the state of bigamy, are not to be promoted to holy orders, and not of one who is already made priest, that he be not for fornication removed. But to understand what was done to a priest (that had committed fornication) by order of law, ^c in case any bishop, or

⁹⁰ [There was a false print in "Lata" for "Lator." The words the margin of the Lat. Apol. of are found in the margin of Extr.]

priest, or deacon, after degree of deaconship taken, had been convict of fornication or advoutery, he was deposed, and cast out of the church, and enjoined to do penance among the laity. Which thing St. Sylvester at length mercifully changed, enjoining ^d ten years penance after a prescript form, which to our new clergy would seem very hard and strait.....

Yea further, the law of the church in this case so little beareth with the sinful life of clerks, that ^e if any bishop in his diocess had consented, and borne with the fornication of priests or deacons, or with the crime of incest, for money, or prayer, or had not by authority of his bishoply office duly punished such faults committed, the same should be suspended from his office..... And this much we have shewed touching the removing of a priest, not only from his benefice, but also from his office, for cause of fornication: wherein these men most falsely have slandered ^d the church, as now to any man it may ^f appear.

^d An hypocritical folly. For he may redeem all this whole ten years fast by paying of a penny: read the answer.

^e Untruth manifest, and a canon of M. Harding's own making.

^f Full clearly, God wot. See the answer.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here, M. Harding, ye shew yourself to be much unskilful in your own *canons*. The simplest *proctor* in your courts could soon have told you, that ye are over far deceived. For thus it is written by express words in your own Gloss upon the Decrees: *Dicunt neminem hodie propter fornicationem esse deponendum, nisi in ea perduret*: ^{Dist. 82. Presbyter. [In Glossa.]} "They say that for *fornication* no man ought this day to be deposed, unless he continue in the same." And lest ye should in any wise mistrust or doubt your Gloss, it is also thus noted of purpose in fair great letters in the margin: *Fornicationis causa hodie nemo est deponendus*: "*Nowadays no man may be deposed for fornication.*" Were there nothing else to be said, yet this thing only were sufficient.

But Panormitane also your greatest *canonist* likewise saith: *Ad varietatem temporum debent mutari statuta humana*: *ideo hodie ex simplici fornicatione clericus non deponitur*: "The laws of men ought to be altered according to the change of times: and therefore nowadays for *simple fornication* no priest is deposed from his benefice." ^{Extra. de Consanguinitate et affinitate. Non debet. Abb. [Panorm. tom. iii. pt. 2. fol. 37. col. 1.]}

Likewise ye have it noted upon your Decrees: *Communitèr dicitur, quod pro simplici fornicatione clericus deponi non debet: quia pauci sine illo vitio inveniuntur*: "It is commonly said, that for *simple fornication* no priest ought to

^{Dist. 81. Maximianus Gloss.}

be deprived: for that few priests are found without that fault."

Extra. de
Cohabit. Cle-
ricor. et
Mulier. Si
autem: [leg.
Quæsitum]
Abb. [tom.
lii. pt. 1. fol.
13. col. 2.]

Again Panormitane saith to like effect: *Clericus concubinarium in officiis vitandum non est, nisi sit notorius*: "A priest that keepeth a concubine, unless he be notorious, may not be refused in his service."

Sundry other such like authorities your poorest proctor could have brought you.

Howbeit, you say, St. Sylvester *in such cases enjoineth ten years penance*. This was true indeed, M. Harding. But it was true in old forne years, about twelve hundred years ago. Now Sylvester is past quite out of mind, and his law with him. Your own folk now can say: *Nunc aliud tempus, alii pro tempore mores*.

Martin. Pœ-
nitentiarius
in Dictio-
nario.

Martinus Pœnitentiarius saith: *Ecclesia multos hujusmodi canones exsufflavil, quia onerosi sunt*: "The church hath blown away many such canons, for that they be too burthenous." Look better on your books, M. Harding.

Dist. 82.
Presb. In
Glossa.

Your own law saith: *Fornicationis causa nemo hodie deponendus est:.....quia corpora hodie sunt fragiliora*: "No man nowadays ought to be deprived for fornication: and that, because our bodies are frailer, than they were wont to be." And therefore, touching that cruel *ten years fast*, appointed by Sylvester's constitution, the Gloss there saith thus: *Potest jejungere per alium: vel potest dare nummum pro jejuniis*: "He may fast by some other man: or else he may give a good penny, and so redeem his whole ten years fast." But there is graciously added a special proviso in the behalf of him that shall receive this penny: *Sed debet iste denarius esse talis, quod non evincatur ab illo cui donatur. Alias non contingeret liberatio*: "But it must be such a penny, that it be never evicted again by law from him that received it. Otherwise he should not be discharged of his penance."

Dist. 34.
Fraternitatis.

In like manner saith pope Pelagius: *Defectus nostri temporis, quibus corpora ipsa hominum defecerunt, distractionis illius non patitur manere censuram*: "The weakness of our time, by mean whereof the very bodies of

men are decayed, doth not suffer the rigour of that law to continue."

Otho in his Constitution Legantine saith: *Removeant ipsas intra mensem: vel ipsas, vel alias de cætero nullatenus detenturi*: "Let priests put away their concubines within a month's respite: afterward to hold neither them, nor any others in any wise." Whereupon the Gloss, with great conscience, and full discreetly, saith thus: *Detenturi, scilicet, per mensem. Alioqui diceremus, quod propter quancunque momentaneam possessionis detentionem sequentem, hanc gravem pœnam incurreret. Quod nimis esset rigorosum, attenda fragilitate nostri temporis*: "They may not afterward hold" (neither the same concubines, nor any other). "Which words you must thus understand: That by the space of a whole month together he may not hold them. Otherwise we should say, that a priest should run into this grievous punishment for any short holding of his concubine in possession following afterward. Which thing indeed were marvellous rigorous, specially considering the frailty of our time."

Again the same Otho saith: *Ordinamus, ut si contra hoc præsumpserint venire, ab officio et beneficio sint suspensi*: "We ordain, that if any priest do contrary hereunto," (living incontinently, contrary to this Constitution,) "that then he be suspended, as well from his benefice, as from his office." Hereunto your Gloss addeth: *Rigorosa quoque esset hæc pœna, nisi esset pro adulterio, vel incestu: etiamsi episcopus esset hujusmodi labens*: "And this punishment also were over rigorous, unless it were for advoutery or incest" (for he may not so be punished for *fornication*): "yea although the party so falling were a bishop." And again in the same Gloss: *Propter solam simplicem fornicationem, de benignitate canonica, non debet clericus deponi, vel privari: licet secus forte de canonis rigore*: "By the courtesy of the canons, only for *simple fornication* a priest may not be deposed from his office, or deprived from his benefice. Albeit, perhaps by the rigour or extremity of the canons it would be otherwise." The very true cause hereof is more plainly expressed in your own Gloss upon the

De Concubinis Clericorum, removeant. Licet ad profugandum. [p. 44.]

[In Glossa ibid. p. 44 f.]

In eodem titulo. [p. 44.]

[Glossa, p. 44 g.]

Extra. de
Purgatione
Canonica,
Accepimus:
In Glossa.
[lib. 5. tit.
34. cap. 16.]

Decretals: *Quia pauci sine vitio carnis inveniuntur*: "For without the vice of the flesh there are but few" (priests) "to be found."

All this notwithstanding, ye say: "If the bishop wink, and dissemble, and bear with the wickedness of a priest in this behalf, that then he himself ought to be punished by suspension from his office." This, M. Harding, is a *canon* of your own making: for other authority ye allege none. But how may it seem likely, that ye so cruelly punish your bishops for favourable dealing herein, seeing your *high and alonely bishop, and the bishop of all bishops*, is so well content, upon agreement for money, to license both *bishops and priests to keep concubines*?

Extra. de
Judiculis, cap.
4. §. De Adul-
teris. [lib. ii.
tit. 1. cap. 4.]

If ye mistrust the truth hereof, besides your common practice, as you know, your own pope Gregory himself will soon tell you: *De adulterio, et aliis minoribus criminibus, episcopus potest cum clericis post pœnitentiam dispensare*: "Touching *adultery, and other small faults*, the

bishop, after penance done, may dispense with a priest." Where also it is to be noted, that *adultery* in your divinity is reckoned among *small faults, and petit sins*. Likewise

Extra. de
Bigamis.
Quia circa.
In Glossa.
[lib. 1. tit. 21.
cap. 6.]

again it is to be noted in your Gloss: *Cum presbyteris habentibus plures concubinas, episcopus potest dispensare, ut suum officium exequantur*: "With priests having *sundry concubines* the bishop may dispense, that they may nevertheless do their office." Wherein ye seem somewhat to overreach the emperor's courtesy touching the same: for

Authen. de
Trien. et Se-
miss. Colla.
3. [tit. 5. cap.
5.]

thus he writeth: *Unam concubinam qui habet, non plures, caste vivit*: "He that keepeth one concubine only, and no mo, liveth chastely⁹¹." And in the said former Gloss ye shall find another special note of your own, well worthy to be written in the pope's privy gallery in letters of gold:

Extra. de
Bigamis.
Quia circa.
In Glossa.
[lib. 1. tit.
21. cap. 6.]
In eadem
Gloss. [ibid.]

Nota, quod plures concubinas habens, non incurrit irregularitatem: "Mark well, that he, that keepeth sundry concubines, is not thereby made irregular." And again: *Nota, mirabile: Quod cum eo qui peccat dispensatur: et cum eo qui non peccat, non dispensatur*: "Mark well, here

⁹¹ [This is rather implied, than expressed.]

is a marvellous strange reckoning: The bishop dispenseth with him that offendeth" (having sundry concubines): "but with him that offendeth not" (having married two wives), "he dispenseth not." And further he saith: *Plus* In eadem Gloss. [ibid.] *habet hic luxuria, quam castitas*: "Here lechery hath more privilege, than chastity."

Again in your Decrees it is written thus: *Quæcunque clericis taliter conjunctæ sunt, auferantur ab episcopo, et veniuntur*: "Whatsoever women have such company with priests, let them be removed by the bishop, and sold, and made slaves." Unto this law, being in itself over rigorous, the Gloss addeth this favourable construction: *Veniuntur: verum est, si [leg. subaudi, quando] contrahunt cum illis, tanquam cum uxoribus. Alias non concedo, posse vendi propter simplicem fornicationem*: "Let them be sold, and made slaves. This is true, *if the priests marry with them, as with their wives*. Otherwise I grant not, that for simple fornication they may be sold."

Likewise again it is noted in your Gloss: *Nota, frequentationem tantum (viduarum et virginum) prohiberi* Dist. 23. His igitur. In Glossa. "Mark well, that it is not the coming to widows or maids, but the often haunting unto them, that is forbidden." Otho in his Legantines saith thus: *Qui detinet publice concubinas, &c.*: "The priest that *openly* keepeth concubines, let him be deposed." Hereupon your Gloss saith thus: *Tu dic, Publice, quando multitudini se patere non exparet.Secus ergo, si secrete intra domum propriam, vel alienam, detineat hanc concubinam. Nam tunc poenam hujus constitutionis non incurret. Domus enim rem secretam, non autem publicam denotat.Dic ergo, Publice, id est, communiter, et coram multis. Non ergo sufficit, quod semel vel bis talis publice videatur*: "He that *openly* keepeth concubines, &c. Understand thou by this word *openly*, if he be not afraid, though he appear unto the people. It is otherwise, if he keep his concubine secretly, whether it be in another man's house, or in his own. For so he cometh not within the danger of this law. For a house betokeneth not an open matter, but a secret. Thus therefore expound thou this Constitution: If he keep his concubine *openly*,

Dist. 81. Quidam Clerici. In Glossa.

Dist. 23. His igitur. In Glossa.

Constitut. Othonis. De Concubinis Clericor. removeud. Licet ad profugandum. [p. 43.]

[Gloss. ibid. p. 43 l.]

that is to say, if he keep her commonly, and in the sight of many. Therefore if such a concubine twice or thrice be seen openly, it is not sufficient." In the same Gloss of yours ye have these words that I have alleged before: *Si non caste, tamen caute*.

And whereas you say, *If a bishop shew favour herein, he himself shall be suspended*: your own doctor abbot Panor-
mitane would have told you the contrary: *Episcopus non tenetur deponere clericum concubinarium*: "The bishop is not bound to deprive a priest that keepeth a concubine."

To make short, ye have also of great providence devised a special *præmunire* to embolden your *priests in fornication*, and to warrant them free from all danger of any your laws made in that behalf. For thus you say: (*Si laicus, instigante diabolo, accuset clericum incontinentiæ, statim repel-litur*⁹².) *Laici in accusatione episcopi audiendi non sunt*: "If a layman, by the instigation of the devil, accuse a priest of incontinent life, straightway he is thrust back, and put to silence. The lay sort may not be heard in the accusation of a bishop." And again: *Laicus non potest (clericum de fornicatione) accusare*: "A layman may not accuse a priest of fornication." This is that extremity, and unmerciful rigour, M. Harding, that ye shew your priests in these cases. *No layman may accuse them: no bishop may deprive them: no law may touch them*.

M. HARDING.

The third lie is, that cardinal Campegius, Albertus Pighius, and certain others have taught, that a priest liveth more holily, and more chastely, that keepeth a concubine, than he that hath taken a wife in matrimony. Why do ye not tell us, where they have taught so? will ye, that we believe your bare word? how can we, having taken you tardy in so many, and so manifest lies? Aristotle once asked, "What a common liar gained by his lying?" a "That," quoth he, "when he telleth truth, no man will believe him." Wisdom would, sirs, ye took good heed, that ye prove not such gainers. Now we require you to bring forth proof of that ye charge these learned men withal. We are sure ye cannot.....

⁹² [The words between brackets do not occur in the place referred to.]

De Cohabitat. Clericor. et Mulier. Si autem: Abb. [Panormi, tom. iii. pt. 1. fol. 11. col. 2.]

2. quest. 7. Laici.

Dist. 84. Maximian. in Glossa.

a This answer much toucheth M. Harding himself.

The words of Pighius be these: "But put the case," saith he, "they which have vowed chastity, all do not that they may and ought to do, to attain the grace of continency: and therefore they be not only tempted, but also overcome with temptation for the more part: what then? shall it be a less evil for them to marry? For to say it is better, thou mayest not, which the apostle imputeth to damnation, if they break their first faith. For these, I say, shall it be less evil, and less damnable to marry, than to be overcome with lusts?".....

Therefore where ye impute unto him, that he maketh the keeping of a concubine to be a more holy, and a more chaste life in a priest, than taking of a wife in matrimony, it is a foul lie, and a false slander. Neither is there in that doctrine any filthiness at all, which Philip Melanchthon, whom here ye follow, chargeth him withal.

Touching that point of doctrine itself, St. Paul confirmeth it, to whom the marriage of those that be bound to vow of continency seemed so wicked and heinous a sin, that he pronounceth the will to marry to be damnable. Now your conjunctions with your yoke-fellows (we mean only so many of you as have vowed chastity) ^b are not indeed wedlocks, but incestuous advouteries. And right so we find them named by Cyprian, Basil, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Hierom, Photius, and other holy and learned fathers ⁹³.

^b Untruth.
For St. Augustine saith
*Qui dicunt
tulum nup-
tius non esse
nuptius, sed
potius adul-
teria, mihi
non videntur
satis acute ac
diligenter
considerare
quid dicant*
De bono Vid.
cap. [vi. 375.]
^c O sage con-
siderations!

But perhaps ye say, both are advouteries, whether a vowed person marry, or commit fornication. Let it be so. ^c Yet is not that sin more grievous which a man committeth of set and determined purpose, than that which he falleth into by human frailty? and that evil which continueth, is it not much worse than that which hath intermission, (and no end?).....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

The Apology saith, that Campegius, Pighius, and others mo of your side have told us, "That a priest keeping a concubine, liveth more holily and more chastely, than a priest that hath a wife, and liveth in matrimony." Here ye cry out, as your wont is, "slanders," "lies," "foul lies," and I know not what. "For thus only they say," say you, "that fornication in this case is less ill than matrimony." Howbeit, M. Harding, laying all cavils and shifts aside, *the less ill*, in use of speech is commonly called *the greater good*. And in this sense it is written: "*Better* it is to die, than to want." And again: "*Better* is the iniquity of a

Ecclus xl.
28.
Ecclus xlii.
14.

⁹³ [For these authorities Harding refers to Hosius de Sacramento Matrimonii.]

2 Pet. ii. 21.

man, than a woman doing well." So Jonas saith: "*Death unto me is better than life.*" So St. Peter saith: "*Better had it been* for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, knowing the same, to be turned back from the holy commandment that is given unto them." These and other like phrases are often used in the holy scriptures, not for that *death*, or *iniquity*, or *ignorance* of God's justice, be good things indeed, but for that, in comparison of other worse things, they seem to import some less ill.

"Fornication," ye say, "is not better than marriage: but marriage is worse than fornication." Thus it seemeth you good to shadow your matters by shift of words from *worse to better*, and from *better to worse*. And yet in all plain men's judgments, If *marriage be worse than fornication*, then is *fornication better than marriage*.

But, to let you understand we have dealt simply and plainly herein, Hulderichus⁹⁴ the bishop of Augusta in Germany, writing unto pope Nicholas against the restraint of priests' marriage above seven hundred years past, useth the like manner of speech as we have used. Thus he saith: *Hujus imperii, ne dicam, consilii, tam fatuam, tamque turpem addunt suggestionem, ut dicant, Honestius est pluribus occulte implicari, quam aperte in hominum vultu et conscientia cum una ligari. Quod profecto non dicerent, si ex illo et in illo essent, qui dicit, Væ vobis Phariseis, qui omnia facitis propter homines*: "Unto this commandment, I will not say, unto this counsel, they set so foolish and so shameful a suggestion, that they say, *It is an honestier thing for a priest to be entangled with many concubines in secret and privily, than openly and in the sight and knowledge of the world to be joined in marriage with one wife.* Which thing verily they would not utter, if they were either of him, or in him, that saith: 'Woe be unto you, ye Pharisees, that do all things to please men'⁹⁵."

In like sort the council of Worms wrote sometime against

Hulderich.
Episco. Au-
gustanus.
[ap. Paral.
Ursperg.]
The same
epistle is
found in an-
cient record
under the
name of
Volusianus
Episcopus
Carthagi-
niensis.

⁹⁴ [Huldericus, supra vol. iv.
p. 615, note ⁸⁸; and p. 616, note
⁸⁹.]

⁹⁵ [See the same work quoted
above vol. iv. p. 615.]

pope Hildebrand : for that he had devised great rigour and tyranny, to sunder priests from their wives : *Scorta pudicis conjugibus : stupra, incestus, adulteria casto connubio.....* Concil. Wormatien. Ex Aventino. [349.]
præfert : “He placeth strumpets before honest wives : and fornication, incest, advoutery, before chaste marriage.”
 Notwithstanding, your doctor Hosius saith : *Turpis Philippo videtur hæc oratio : catholicas autem honestissima :* Hosius in Petricovien. Confess. cap. 56. [fol. 68. col. 3.]
 “These words unto Philip Melanchthon seem shameful : but unto the catholics they seem most honest.”

What need we many words in so clear a case ? The whole practice of your church, M. Harding, professeth the same. If a priest marry a wife, ye suspend him : ye excommunicate him : ye deprive him : ye disquiet and trouble the whole church. But if he keep a concubine, one, two, or mo, ye are then contented, and ready, not only to dissemble it, but also with favour to excuse it. For so ye say, as it is alleged before : *Clericus concubinarius in officiis vitandus non est, nisi sit notorius* : “A priest that keepeth a concubine, unless he be very notorious, may not be eschewed in his service.” Again ye shall find this lesson specially noted in your rubric, as it is said before : *Qui non habet uxorem, loco illius concubinam debet [leg. licet] habere* : Extr. de Cohabit. Cleric. et Mulier. cap. final. Abb. [Pannorm. tom. iii. pt. 1. fol. 13. col. 2.] Dist. 34. Is qui.
 “He that hath not a wife, instead of her ought to have a concubine.” Ye will say, *There is an error in your print* : which thing may easily be granted, specially the whole book being otherwise so full of errors. But would God your errors in life and doctrine were no greater. Howbeit, it followeth immediately in the same Decree : *Is qui non habet uxorem, et pro uxore concubinam habet, a communione non repellatur* : “Whoso hath no wife, and instead of a wife hath a concubine, let him not be removed from the communion.” In these words, I trow, ye will say there is no error.

Upon the Legantine Constitutions of Otho, ye may find these words noted in the Gloss : *Nunquid compelli potest clericus concubinam abjurare ? Videtur, quod non. Resolutio : Si clericus duxit uxorem de facto, eo casu juramentum exigitur* : “Whether may a priest be forced to forswear his concubine ? It seemeth, he may not. The resolution hereof Constit. Othonis de Concubinis Cleric. re-movendis. Licet ad profugandum. [p. 44 h.]

is this : If a priest have indeed married a wife, in this case he is forced to forsake her by an oath."

Therefore we may say to you, as St. Augustine said sometime to the Manichees: *Non concubitum, sed ut longe ante ab apostolo dictum est, vere nuptias prohibetis*: "Ye forbid not copulation: but, as it was long ago forespoken by the apostle, indeed ye forbid very marriage."

Augustin. de
Moribus Ma-
nich. lib. 2.
cap. 18. [l.
739.]

Concil. Tri-
dent. sess. 1.
[Crabb. iii.
979.]

Now, forasmuch, as ye say, *ye are no angels, and your infirmities ought to be considered, and to be borne withal*, it shall not be amiss shortly to see, what your own friends have thought of these *infirmities*. And here to pass over other authorities, your own doctor the bishop of Bitonto, being present at your late chapter at Trident, of your whole single life, which ye call chastity, pronounceth thus: *Quibus turpitudinum monstris, qua sordium colluvie, qua peste non sunt corrupti, non fœdati in ecclesia sancta Dei, et populus, et sacerdos? A sanctuario Dei incipite, patres, si ullus jam pudor, si ulla pudicitia, &c. Dicunt in corde impio, et ore impuro, Non est Deus*: "With what monsters of filthiness, with what villainy, with what pestilence are they not corrupted and defiled in the church of God, both the people and the priest? My lords, begin even with the sanctuary of God: if there be any shame, if there be any honest life. They say with wicked heart and filthy mouth, There is no God."

Hermannus
Riddus, de
vita et ho-
nest. Cler.
[p. 144.]

Another saith: *Propter multitudinem luxuriæ, alia vitiaquasi non peccata reputantur*: "For the multitude of lechery" (that is in priests), "other faults are taken for no sin."

Paral. Ur-
spurg. in
Clemen. V.
[A. D. 1303.
et sqq.]

Another saith: *Defecit jam omnis disciplina, et religio in cardinalibus: et tres radices vitiorum, superbia, avaritia, luxuria validissime dominantur*: "In the cardinals now all discipline and religion is decayed: and three roots of sins, pride, covetousness, and lechery, do most mightily prevail."

Bernard. in
Cantic. serm.
66. [iv. p.
1497.]

St. Bernard saith: *Fingunt, se amore castitatis ista dicere: cum ea magis causa turpitudinis fovendæ, et multiplicandæ adinvenerint*: "They bear us in hand, that they speak these things for love of chastity: whereas indeed they have devised the same, to the end to nourish and to increase

their filthiness." This, M. Harding, is your *infirmity*, which, in your judgment, of courtesy and charity, we ought to bear withal.

The places of St. Cyprian, St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, St. Hierom, and others, that may seem much to make with you in this case, and to condemn this kind of marriage, are weighed and answered before in a place more convenient. Verily St. Augustine saith: *Graviter peccant, qui tales dividunt*: "They sin grievously, that divide them that be so married."

Part 2. ch. 8.
divis. 7. [supra vol. iv.
p. 571.]
Dist. 27.
Quidam.

M. HARDING.

Where ye say, there be many thousands of common harlots in Rome, we think there be many there indeed. Whether there be many thousands, we doubt. What number soever there is, they be too many.....Those courtesans the church of Rome doth^a tolerate, not nourish, trusting and looking, that by sermons, exhortations, and other convenient means, they may be called back to repentance, and to the way of salvation.....

a Not nourish, but tolerate. A proper excuse and a sore punishment of open whoredom.

That the pope gathereth about a thirty thousand ducats yearly of these courtesans by way of an annual pension, which these defenders affirm,^b it is utterly false. Cornelius Agrippa, who favoured not the see of Rome, and was imbrued with heresies that sprang up in his time, was the first author of this slander. If they pay the common taxes, which be levied to the pope, who only hath civil dominion over that city, they^c pay not for that they may be suffered to continue that sinful trade of life, but so as the whole city payeth by polls, for that there they have their abode and habitation.....

b Untruth. For it is most true, as it shall appear.

c Untruth manifest, for unless they pay, they shall not occupy.

First it is common to all the great cities in those hot countries, not to banish from among them that filthy generation of harlots, not by way of suffering, as a thing commendable in itself, but for the avoiding of a greater mischief. As^d God suffered the hard necked Jews to hate their enemies, and pinch them with usuries. Likewise Moses permitted a libel of divorce, not that these things were honest, but to the intent by that means yet they might the rather love their brethren, and lend them money freely, and abstain from murdering their wives. Even so men nowadays so little apply their endeavour to restrain the proneness which is in their flesh to all riot and carnal concupiscence, that if some way were not (at the least concerning outward and civil punishment) winked at, whereby the fleshly men might obtain some part of^e their unruly desire: it were more than likely, that in this great decay of virtue in general, the furious rage of that vice would leave neither wedlock undefiled, nor virginity unassaulted, nor a worse enterprise, which nature abhorreth, unattempted. Would

d The pope may dispense as well as God.

e This is a jolly catholic divine.

God experience had not taught many countries this to be too true an observation.....

f St. Augustine wrote these books, *De Ordine*, before he was baptized.

St. Augustine hereof saith : f *Quid sordidius*, &c. : “What can be said more unclean, more void of comeliness, more full of turpitude, than harlots, bawds, and such other like pestilences ? Take harlots from among men, ye shall disturb all things with lecherous lusts. Put the same in the stead of matrons, ye shall dishonest (all things) with spot and shame.....” And why is the bishop of Rome to be blamed for that they be in Rome, more than the French king, the king of Spain, or any other prince, for suffering them in their dominions ?

[S. Aug. de Ordine, 2. tom. i. 335.]

g A vile untruth. They are not necessary.

It remaineth, we seek whether they have also the lowest and vilest place in that city, or no : lest perhaps, although they be a necessary evil, yet, being promoted above their degree, they make an evil show in the body where they rest. Their place may be considered two ways, in respect of the temporal, or of the ecclesiastical order or law. For temporal order thus they stand : Not to have free liberty of dwelling in the most haunted streets and palaces where them list, but h only to be in such corners and bye-lanes, and small outhouses, as are most fit shops for the vile merchandise of such occupiers. Again they cannot without a very great forfeit ride in i coaches or chariots as matrons there do, but are constrained either to keep their homely homes, or to walk afoot in the streets. And then also by order they must be k in such apparel, that, as Jews by their red caps, so they by their short veils (a note of dishonesty) be known to all, and be subject to all shrewdness of the boys of the streets, who use commonly to mock and revile them.....

h Untruth. For the cardinals themselves say : *Habitant insignes ædes*.

i Untruth. For the cardinals say, *Mula vehuntur*.

k Untruth. For the cardinals say, *Incedunt ut matronæ*.

l This is one of the cardinal virtues of Rome, to take toll of bawdry.

And here I cannot but dislike with that malice which appear-eth to be in the makers of this Apology. For l it is a virtue in the prince to set great burdens and payments upon so filthy a profession, to the end he may fear women from it, and make them the sooner weary of it, &c. In good sooth, masters, ye are too young to control the city of Rome in her doings

m Untruth. See the answer.

Besides all this, if in that sinful state they continue to their end without repentance, m it is not lawful for them to make any testament or last will for bestowing of their goods, but as condemned and infamous persons, they must leave all to be confiscated and disposed at the prince's pleasure. But on the other side, if they turn and repent, there are houses called *the monasteries of the convertites*, and special provision and discipline for them, where they are taught how to bewail their unchaste life so sinfully past over.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Touching the number of your *courtesans of Rome*, whether they be twenty thousand, or mo, or less, we will not strive. They be leased out in fee farm : the popes

rents are always certain. For *fornication* is fineable in Rome, and a good saleable kind of sin. "But this," you say, "is another lie, as false and as slanderous as the rest. For," ye say, "they pay no yearly pension for their sufferance in that trade of life: but only the common taxes, which are likewise raised upon other citizens." Whether it be so or no, M. Harding, so it is sufficient for you to say. Otherwise the pope, raising such fines upon bawdry, might well be thought to be the bawd.

Howbeit, your own doctors herein will soon condemn you. For thus it is written by them in your own Gloss:

Videtur, quod crimen meretricii ecclesia sub dissimulatione transire debeat. Nam et marescallus papæ de facto exigit tributum a meretricibus: "It seemeth, that the church ought to dissemble the fault of whoredom. For the pope's marshal indeed receiveth a *tribute or pension of whores*." Constit. Othonis, de Concubinis Clericor. re-movendis. [p. 44 h.]

Whereas ye say, *Cornelius Agrippa was the first author of this slander*, it is untrue. For your own Gloss, last before alleged, avoucheth it by the authority of Johannes Joh. Andreas, a notable canonist, that lived well near two hundred years before Agrippa was born. And Nicolas de Clavengiis⁹⁶, that lived in the time of the emperor Sigismund, in his book entitled *De corrupto Ecclesiæ statu*, hath one special chapter: *De exactionibus pro concubinis tolerandis*: "Of exactions for the suffering of concubines." Joh. Andreas mortuus est ann. 1348. Nicolaus de Clavengiis: in Paralipomen. Ursperg. anno 1417.

But all this ye wipe away easily with one word. For ye say: "The courtesans in Rome pay these impositions, not as a portion of their unthrifty gains, but only as a punishment for their wicked life." For it is not lawful there to commit sin freely, without payment. And thus is the matter of your part well defended.

So it is noted upon your Decrees: *Quod dicitur, Sacerdos non potest percipere mercedem prostibuli, potest dici, quod non debet recipi oblatio meretricis: licet elemosyna possit inde fieri*: "Whereas it is said, The priest may not receive the *reward or oblation of the stewes*, we may say, that the oblation of an harlot may not be received: notwithstanding" 14. quest. 5. Quid vero. in Glossa. Et dist. 90. Oblatio. in Glossa.

⁹⁶ [The proper name is Clemangis: supra vol. iv. p. 615.]

we may make an *almose of the same*." That is to say, A harlot's money may be taken by the way of *almose*, but not by the way of *oblation*. Thus are we taught, and it behoveth us to believe, that the pope may live, not by the *oblations* of his *courtesans*, but by their *almose*.

Now, forasmuch as M. Harding would so fain have this matter to pass by the name of a *punishment of these ill women*, I beseech thee, good reader, to consider, how grievously, and with what extremity and rigour of law they have devised to have them punished. In a *provincial council* holden at Oxford it is written thus: *Concubine sacerdotum moneantur ab archidiacono, &c.*: "*Let priests' concubines be warned by the archdeacon, &c. If they will not amend, then let them be forbidden to kiss the pax, and to take holy bread in the church.*" With such extremity and cruelty they keep the people from doing ill.

Constit. provin. Edmund. Cantuar. Archiepiscop. [Lyndw. p. 11.]

It was neither for your profession, M. Harding, nor for your gravity, to become a *proctor for the stews*. Although it might well become Leontium, an heathen *courtesan* of lewd conditions, that way to bestow her wit and eloquence against Theophrastus, in the defence of that filthy state, yet may not the same likewise become a Christian man, and a professor of divinity.

Ye call your courtesans *a necessary evil*: but by what authority of the scriptures, I cannot tell. That the whole trade and life of them is ill, we take it, as your grant: but that they be *necessary* in any Christian commonwealth, I reckon it very hard for you to prove. Ye allege the *heat of the country*, as if that were a sufficient warrant for your stews. And yet, I trow, the town of Louvain, and the country of Brabant, where ye now inhabit, is not so hot. The heats of Jewry are thought far to pass all the heats of Italy. Yet God saith unto the Jews: *Non erit ulla meretrix de filiabus Israel, nec scortator de filiis Israel*: "There shall be no whore of the daughters of Israel, nor whorekeeper of the sons of Israel." And even now, wheresoever the gospel of Christ is openly and freely received, notwithstanding the heat of the country, your *stews and bordells* fly away, as the night clouds before the sun. But after that your

Deut. xxiii. 17.

priests were once forbidden lawful marriage, then was it needful, that your *necessary ill* should come in place. Howbeit St. Paul saith: "Let us not do ill, that good may follow, for just is the damnation of them that so say." Rom. iii. 8.

But St. Augustine *standeth full of your side*: St. Augustine hath written in the behoof of the *steews*: St. Augustine saith: "Take harlots away from among men, and ye fill all the country with ribaudry and villainy." Indeed August. de Ordine, lib. 2. [i. 335.] the very name of St. Augustine is great and reverend. But what if St. Augustine, when he wrote these words, were not St. Augustine? what if he wrote that book, *De Ordine*, being as yet a very young man, and but a novice in the faith: not yet well instructed: not yet baptized in the name of Christ: himself as yet keeping a concubine, and living in whoredom? shall such a one, so young and so youthful, go for a *saint*? or shall his bare name and unseasoned phantasies stand you in stead, to prove your *steews*?

Verily the same St. Augustine, being afterward fully instructed and christened, saith thus: *Istam in usu scortatorum terrena civitas licitam fecit turpitudinem*: "The worldly city" (not the church of God) "hath made this filthiness of harlots to be lawful." And Ludovicus Vives, writing upon the same, saith: *Satis aperte Augustinus testatur, jure civili veteri Romano multa esse permissa, quæ sint contraria legibus Divinis. Hoc isti nolunt, qui, dum gentilitatem conjungere, et coaptare Christianismo laborant, corrupto utroque, et alterius impatiente, nec gentilitatem, nec Christianismum retinent*: "St. Augustine plainly witnesseth, that by the old civil Roman" (and heathen) "law, many things were suffered, which were contrary to the laws of God. This thing will not these men allow, who, while they study" (as you, M. Harding, do) "to join heathenness and Christianity both together, both being corrupted, and the one not standing with the other, keep now neither heathenness nor Christianity." August. de Civitate, lib. 14. cap. 18. [vii. 369.]
Ludo. Vives. in Librum de Civitate, lib. 14. cap. 18. [tom. ii. p. 88.]

Therefore we may much better exchange these words of St. Augustine, spoken in his youth, before he had well learned to speak: and may much better say thus: *Per-*

mitte lupanaria: et implebis omnia libidinibus: “Suffer and allow the stews, and ye shall fill all the country with ribaudry and villainy.” And in this sense St. Bernard saith: *Tolle de ecclesia honorabile conjugium, et torum immaculatum: nonne repleas eam concubinariis, incestuosis, seminifluis, mollibus, masculorum concubitoribus, et omni denique genere immundorum?* “Take once from the church honourable marriage, and the bed undefiled: and dost thou not fill the same church full of brothels, keeping concubines, &c. and with all sorts of filthy persons?”

Bernard, in
Cant. serm.
66. [tom. iv.
1498.]

Further ye say: “And wherefore is the bishop of Rome more to be blamed for maintenance of his stews, than the French king, or the king of Spain?” This is but a simple reason for a doctor of divinity. It is an old saying:

NIL JUVAT EXEMPLUM, QUOD LITEM LITE RESOLVIT.

Christ bade not his apostles, to be led by the example of worldly princes. If it be ill in them, it is much worse in him, that would be called the vicar of Christ, the head of the church, and the holy one of Israel.

“Another part of their punishment is,” as you tell us, “that they may not ride sumptuously in coaches or chariots, or dwell in the open fair streets, and in the sight of the city: but are forced to go afoot, and to hide themselves in corners, and in outhouses, and bye-lanes:” and that, by your description, in such simple, and poor, and beggarly sort, as if they were the vilest and ugliest of all the people, and had not a good clout to cover their bodies. Certainly, M. Harding, your *courtesans*, if they understood hereof, would think themselves little beholden to such a proctor.

Doctor Peter Martyr, of whom I cannot speak without great reverence, having good cause to know the state of Rome, as few men better, hereof writeth thus: *Nunc, O Deus bone, quomodo Romæ coercentur meretrices? Habent ornatissimas domos: vehuntur per publicum habitu principum: sedent in equis gradariis: habent secum torquatos, et larvatos comites, interdum etiam cardinales, præsertim noctu: et ancillarum sumptuosissimum gregem:* “Nowadays, O good God, how are the courtesans punished in

Petr. Martyr.
in lib. Judi-
cum, cap. 16.

Rome? *They dwell in the fairest houses : they are carried with honour through the city, as if they were ladies : they are mounted on ambling palfreys : they are attended with chains of gold, and persons disguised, and sometimes cardinals, and specially in the night season, and have a sumptuous sort of maids to wait upon them."*

If ye shall happen to doubt M. Martyr's report in this behalf, yet I trust ye will give some credit to your own friends, the *cardinals* of the church of Rome. Their words hereof be these : *In hac etiam urbe meretrices, ut matronæ, incedunt per urbem seu mula vehuntur : quas assectantur de media die nobiles, familiares cardinalium, clericique. Nulla in urbe vidimus hanc corruptionem, præterquam in hac omnium exemplari. Habitant etiam insignes ædes :* "In this city of Rome the courtesans pass through the streets, or ride on their mules, like honest matrons or ladies : and in the midst of the day, *noblemen, the cardinals' dear friends, and priests*, attend upon them. We never saw such corruption, but only in this city, which is the example and pattern of all others. Moreover they dwell in fair and notable houses." This information was presented unto pope Paul the Third, by certain of his gravest *cardinals*, Anno 1538. appointed thereto by special commission.

Now, good Christian reader, I beseech thee, consider the conformity of these tales. M. Harding saith, "The courtesans of Rome go only afoot:" these *cardinals* say, "They ride on their mules." M. Harding saith, "They have a special apparel of dishonesty to be known by:" these *cardinals* say, "They go, or ride, as honest matrons, or great ladies, or noblewomen." M. Harding saith, "They be despised, and reviled of the people:" these *cardinals* say, "They have priests, noblemen, and the cardinals' friends to attend upon them." M. Harding saith, "They dwell only in outhouses, and back lanes:" these *cardinals* say, *Habitant insignes ædes :* "They dwell in fair and notable houses." So many untruths it is no hard matter for M. Harding to utter in so short a tale. Now, being so fine dames, and so richly attired, it were great slander to say, "They serve only for varlets or common rascals." If the

Concilium
delectorum
Cardinalium,
Concil. [ed.
Crabb.] tom.
3. p. 823.]

report be true, upon twelfth-day at night, in the year of our Lord 1564, there were seen seventeen coaches of courtesans, arriving together even into the pope's own palace. If any man shall think this report incredible, yet Luitprandus, of the like hereof, saith thus: *Lateranense palatium, sanctorum quondam hospitium, nunc est postibulum meretricum*: "The pope's palace at Lateran, sometime the harbour of holy saints, is now become a stew of whores."

Anno 1564.
Luitprandus,
lib. 6. cap. 6.

Cynus Pistoriens.
[fol. 200.]

Baldus.
Bartholus.
[596.]

De Immunita. Eccles.
cap. 14. Abb.
[Panorm.
tom. iii. pt. 1.
fol. 231. col. 1.]

Another part of their punishment, ye say, is this: "That as condemned and infamous persons, at their end they can make no testament, nor take order with that they have." If this were true, it were a good token that the pope is covetous to have their goods, more than desirous to save [ed. 1570, have] their souls. Howbeit the best learned, and most notable *canonists*, that ye have, affirm the contrary. For proof whereof read Cynus Pistoriensis⁹⁷, in *L. Cum te. C. De conditione ob turpem causam*: read Baldus *L. 1. C. in eodem capite*: read Bartholus in *L. Idem ff. eodem capite*. Abbas Panormitane, after long disputation had touching this matter, thus saith his judgment in the end: *Conclude ergo ex omnibus præmissis, quod meretrix turpiter non recipit dona, vel promissionem: et quod potest de illis ad libitum disponere*: "Of all these premisses conclude you thus, That a harlot may receive rewards or promises, without infamy or shame" (of the law), "and that of the same she may dispose at her pleasure." Therefore, M. Harding, this tale would have been better studied. For this punishment, that ye have here imagined, by the judgment of the learned, is no punishment at all.

Primasius
ad Rom. ii.
Ephes. v. [p. 11.]

"In good sooth, sirs," ye say further, "ye are too young to control the city of Rome in her doings." Yet, in the rebuking of open vice, no man ought to be thought too young. But of what age then are you, M. Harding, that are able thus to defend the city of Rome in open whoredom? Primasius saith: *Nemo periculosius peccat, quam qui peccata defendit*: "No man sinneth with more danger, than he that standeth in defence of sin." St. Paul saith: "Let

⁹⁷ [Cynus Pistoriensis. He is speaking, however, not of *wills*, but of *payments*.]

no man deceive you with vain words. For because hereof the anger of God cometh upon the children of infidelity. Be not therefore partakers with them."

And whereas you say, "This policy is thought necessary, for the eschewing of a greater ill," your law telleth you: *Abjicienda sunt falsa remedia, quæ veris, et manifestis periculis sunt graviora*: "We must abandon vain remedies, that are more grievous than the true and manifest dangers." Extr. de Celeb. Miss. De homine. [lib. iii. tit. 41. cap. 7.]

St. Augustine saith: *Non vult Deus tale lucrum compensari tali damno*: "God will not have such a gain to be recompensed with such a loss." St. Paul saith, as we have alleged before: "They say, Let us do ill, that good may follow." But he addeth withal: "Therefore just is their damnation." Tertullian saith: *Lupanaria execrabilia sunt coram Deo*: "Stews are accursed before God." And therefore to conclude, the emperor Justinian, notwithstanding all your necessities and policies, straitly commandeth, that harlots be banished out of all towns⁹⁸. Rom. iii. 8. Tertull. de Anim. [p. 284.] Authen. de Lenonibus. [Collat. 3. tit. i.]

But here, good Christian reader, this one thing I beseech thee uprightly and indifferently to consider, what thing will not these men defend, that can thus boldly defend confessed filthiness? or, when will they reform the church of God, that in so long time cannot yet reform their open stews?

"These harlots," ye say, "sometimes repent them and amend their lives." God of his mercy grant, that you, M. Harding, may once do the like: lest the words of the prophet fall upon you, *Frons meretricis est tibi*. God grant, that "harlots and sinners go not before you in the kingdom of God." Jerem. iii. 3. Matt. 21. 31.

M. HARDING.

That ye tell of a woman named Joan, bearing the world in hand she was pope of Rome, it is a fond and a vain fable. Were ye so wise, as ye be malicious, ye would never have brought your credit in hazard by reporting such vanity. This I account for one of your accustomed lies. By this men may judge, what little store of true things ye have to object against us. Who listeth

⁹⁸ [The law in question seems to apply only to "Lenones."]

a Onuphrius is a man yet living, hired of purpose to face out this matter.

to see a learned discourse written hereof, him may it please to read the annotations of ^a Onuphrius Pamvinius upon Platina, *De vitis Pontificum*, printed in Venice, and he shall easily believe the whole matter to be fabulous.....

In vita Jo-
han. 8.

After Anastasius, they that in their writings recite an exact row and order of popes, as Ademar of Paris, Regino, Hermannus, Schafnaburgensis, Otho Frisingensis, Abbas Urspergensis, Leo bishop of Hostia, Johannes of Cremona, and Godfridus Viterbiensis, of which some wrote three hundred, some four hundred years past, all these make no mention at all of this woman pope Joan. Again there be in *Bibliotheca Palatina*, at Rome, six or seven tables of the popes' names written in sundry books, before the time of Innocentius the Fourth.....Marry in the margin of Pandulphus this fable is put in between Leo the Fourth, and Benedict the Third, written in a hand far different from the old characters of that ancient book, added by some man of latter time. Which maketh the matter to be the more suspected, and taken for a fable.....

b Semiramis, being a woman was of long time taken for a man: yet men's eyes were not bewitched.

c God hath suffered others as very monsters to sit in that see, as ever was pope Joan.

d Untruth. For there were other before him that wrote the same.

Though men had at that time been so far bewitched and distract of their five wits, ^b as they could not have known a woman from a man, (which no wise man I ween believeth,) yet ^c it is not to be thought that God himself, who appointed and ordained the seat of Peter, whereof he would the whole church to be directed, would depart so far from his merciful providence toward the church, as to suffer the same to be polluted by a woman, which is not of capacity for holy orders.

^d The first author of this fable was one Martinus Polonus, a monk of the order of Cisterce: who wrote long after the time that pope Joan is feigned to have lived in. Whose manner of writing if we consider, we shall find it vain, and nothing like to be true. It beginneth thus: *Johannes Anglicus natione, Maguntinus*, [al. *Margantinus*] *sedit annos duos, mensem unum, dies quatuor*, &c.: "John an Englishman by nation, of Maguntia, sat (in the Roman see) two years, one month, and four days, *alias*, five months and three days." What a foolish speech is this? an Englishman Maguntine, or of Maguntia?.....It followeth in the fable, as the said Martin telleth. "This (as it is said) was a woman, and in the young age of a girl, she was brought to Athens by one that was her lover in a man's apparel, and there profited so much in diverse sciences, as none was found to be compared with her." To Athens was she brought, saith the fable. And why? for learning. Very well. Whereas at that time ^e neither any Athens stood, ^e neither was there any place of learning there any longer: but all the country of Attica became barbarous, and utterly void of learning, as we understand by the writers of that time. The author reporteth, that from thence she came to Rome, and there professed learning openly, and had great doctors to her scholars, and for opinion of learning and good life, by one consent of all, was made pope. Which is soon

[Martin, Polon. Supput. p. 150.]

[al. Margantinus.]

e Untruths, two together.

confuted as false : ^f for there was no learning at those days openly ^f Two un-
 professed in Rome, as ^f the stories declare..... truths. Read
 the answer.

It followeth in the fable : " Being in the popedom she is be-
 gotten with child of her servant. And not knowing the time of
 her deliverance, as she went from St. Peter's to Lateran, strained
 with pains, between Colosseo and St. Clement's church, she
 brought forth and died, and was," as they say, " there buried."
 Here is to be marked, how the ^g deviser of this fable bewrayeth ^g This de-
 himself, and thinketh the matter hard to be believed. And viser dwelt
 therefore in the beginning saith, she was a woman *ut asseritur*, ^{lived above}
 as folks say : and now he saith, she is buried *ut dicitur*, ^{five hundred}
 as it is said. So he doth not affirm it to be true, but referreth all to years ago.
 hearsay. By which testimony lies commonly be soothed.....

And as it is false, that ever there was any such pope, so is it
 not true, that ye note in the margent of your book touching the
 image, which ye say is to be seen yet in Rome, resembling that
 woman pope lying in travail. The image, which ye mean, I have
 seen myself at Rome, graven in a stone, after the manner of a
 tombstone, pitched upright not far from the Colosseo. It re-
 sembleth no such thing ye speak of.....

Neither is it of any more truth, which some have ignorantly
 written of the pope's refraining to go that way, when he goeth
 thereby in solemn processions : nor that which I have read in
 some of your ^h school-fellows' peevish books of the stool of ease- ^h Untruth.
 ment, that is at Lateran made of fair porphyry stone, which they For they lived
 have reported to be kept there for an unseemly use at the crea- five hundred
 tion of the popes, for proof of their *humanity*. Thus, we trust, years before
 we have brought your great matter of pope Joan to nought. us : and were
 the best
 writers of
 that time.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here, in your judgment, is another of our *foul shameful
 accustomed lies*. And that ye prove by the authority of
 one Onuphrius, one of the pope's late pages, specially hired
 and procured to help out this matter. Of the truth and
 certainty hereof, we shall consider further in the end.
 Now let us examine this new *conjectural doctor* with his
 guesses.

First, he saith, dame Joan is not registered in the <sup>Not register-
 ed.</sup>
calendar among the popes : *ergo*, it is but a vain fable, that
 ever dame Joan was pope in Rome. This conjecture,
 M. Harding, is very simple ; for I doubt not, but ye may
 well remember, that bishops' names, as well in Rome as
 otherwheres, have upon sundry occasions been oftentimes
 quite stricken out of the *calendar*.

So was Chrysostom's name, upon displeasure, quite

stricken out of the table of the bishops of Constantinople, as if he had never been bishop there^a.

^a In vita
Chrysost.

And Chrysostom himself, writing unto Cyriacus in his own defence, saith thus: *Siquidem hoc feci, expungatur nomen meum ex albo episcoporum: et non scribatur in libro orthodoxæ fidei*: "If I have thus done, let my name be rased out of the bishops' calendar: and let it not be registered in the book of the catholic faith^b."

^b Chrysost.
epist. 3. ad
Cyriacum.
[iii. 668.]

And afterward, his name being so defaced and rased out, was restored again by Theodotus, at the vehement request and instance of the people^c. So Acacius, the bishop of Constantinople, rased out the name of pope Felix of Rome^d. So Innocentius, the bishop of Rome, rased out the name of Arsacius, the bishop of Constantinople^e. And this is it, that St. Augustine meaneth, writing to the people of Hippo: *Quid obest homini, quod ex illa tabula non vult eum recitari humana ignorantia, si de libro vivorum non eum delet iniqua conscientia?* "What hurt is that unto a man, that the ignorant people will not suffer his name to be read out of that *table*, if wicked conscience blot him not out of the book of life?"

^c Niceph. lib.
14. cap. 26.
[ii. 492.]

^d Gelasius ad
Episcopos
Dardanien.
[Crabb, Con-
cill. i. 978.]

^e Niceph. lib.
13. cap. 34.
[ii. 419.]

Augustin.
epist. 137.
[ii. 184.]

Johannes de
Parisiis, de
potest. Regia
et Pap. cap.
24. [p. 144.]

So writeth Johannes de Parisiis of pope Cyriacus: *Cyriacus papa renuntiavit officio, ut cum Ursula, et virginibus palmam martyrii susciperet. Sed iste Cyriacus in catalogo paparum non annumeratur: quia credebant, ipsum non propter devotionem, sed propter oblectamentum virginum dimisisse episcopatum*: "Pope Cyriacus gave over his bishopric, that with Ursula, and other maids, he might receive the crown of martyrdom. But this Cyriacus is not reckoned in the calendar of the popes: for that it was believed, he had given over his bishopric, not of devotion, but for some phantasy towards the maids."

But to come near the purpose, and to the force of your guesses, therefore was pope Joan's name left out of the calendar of the bishops of Rome, not for that there never was any such pope there: but only for shame, lest it should appear in record, and afterward be reported for ever, that *a woman, and such a woman, had been bishop of Rome: or that the bishop of Rome had been with child.*

So saith Marianus Scotus⁹⁹: *Hujus Joannæ nomen auctoritates pontificii non ponunt propter turpitudinem rei, et muliebrem sexum*: "The chroniclers, that write of the popes, leave out the name of pope Joan, both for the shame of the matter, and also for the womankind." So saith Martinus: *Johanna non ponitur in catalogo sanctorum pontificum, tam propter muliebrem sexum, quam propter deformitatem facti*: "Pope Joan is not reckoned in the calendar of the holy popes, as well for that she was a woman, as also for the shame of the matter." So saith Sabellicus: *Nullus defunctæ honor habitus. Fama tenet ob tam fœdæ rei memoriam*¹. . . . : "There was no honour bestowed at her burial. The report is, for the remembrance of her filthy act." So saith Johannes de Parisiis²: so saith *Fasciculus Temporum*. Therefore this first reason is but a very blind conjecture, and beareth no force.

Another of your guesses is this: "Men had been bewitched and distracted of their wits, if they could not have known a woman from a man." This reason, M. Harding, beareth as great weight and substance, as the former. For your own Amphilochius, that wrote the life of Thomas Becket, could have told you, that Euphrosyna, that holy maid, dwelt six and thirty years in *monk's* apparel among *monks*, and was never otherwise taken, but for a *monk*.

Likewise Vincentius, and Petrus de Natalibus³, and others your writers and recorders of fables, could have told you, that Tecla sometime addressed herself in man's apparel, and, had she not been forbidden by St. Paul, would have followed him in company as a man. Ravisius Textor writeth the like of one Marina, that dissembling what she was, lived many years in an abbey as a monk. The like

⁹⁹ [Marianus Scotus names pope Joan, but it is Martinus Polonus (published in the same vol.) who states the fact, and the reason of the omission of her name.]

¹ [The sentence goes on "Romanos pontifices, cum Lateranum hodie petunt, ibi loci via deflectere."]

² [Johan. de Parisiis. "ut si esset fœmina vel hæreticus, sicut fuerunt aliqui, qui ob hoc non enumerentur in catalogo paparum."]

³ [Petr. de Natalibus says nothing of Thecla's wearing man's apparel, and only states that she learnt the faith from the words of the apostle himself.]

Marianus Scotus. [ann. 852.]

Martinus Polonus. [Supput. ad calc. Marian. Scot. p. 152.]

Sabellicus Ennead. 9. lib. 1. p. 469.

Johan. de Parisiis, de Potestat. Reg. et Papali. [p. 142.] Fasciculus Temporum. [ann. 844.]

M. Harding's Amphilochius.

Vincentius, [in Spec.] lib. 9. cap. 47. Petr. de Natalibus, lib. 8. cap. 110. Ravisius Textor, in Officina: Mulieres virilem habitum mentite. [lib. 2. cap. 31.]

Simeon Metaphrast. in
Eugenia. [ap.
Surium, vol.
vi. 976.]
Copus Dial.
2. p. 236.

he writeth of Lasthenia, Axiothea, and others, that being women, came into the school in man's apparel to hear Plato. The like writeth your own fabular Simeon Metaphrastes, of Eugenia. And if ye lack other authorities of trust and credit, one of your own companions of Louvain avoucheth the same of Melania and Papula. And yet I think "he was not bewitched," as you say, "nor thoroughly bereft of his wits."

Anglicus.

The quarrel, that ye pick to the *name and sirname*, is nothing else but a childish cavil. For she was not called Joan English, by the name of the country, for that she was an English woman, born in England, as you full fondly imagine, but only by the sirname of her father. So are there many known this day by the names of Scot, Irish, French, Welsh, Westfaling, Norman, Gascoigne, Brabant, Holland: and yet not born in any of all these countries, but only in England. So Matthias Parisiensis, as it is supposed, notwithstanding his name, was born in Bohemia.

Therefore, whereas ye would have the words vainly and without sense to be read and pointed thus: *Johannes Anglicus natione, Moguntinus*, &c.: "John an Englishman by nation, of Moguntia," &c. ye play, and toy, and trifle unseemly, and mock your reader. For the words are clear, and plain, and lie thus: *Johannes Anglicus, natione Moguntinus*, &c.: "John English," so surnamed, "born at Mens."

God's suffer-
ance.

Further ye say: "God would never have so forsaken Peter's chair, as to suffer it to be polluted by a woman, which is not of capacity for holy orders." This guess, M. Harding, presumeth over far of God's providence. And therefore Antoninus the archbishop of Florence, when he had opened this whole story of pope Joan, being astounded with the strangeness and admiration of the matter, could not refrain himself from crying out: *O altitudo sapientiae et scientiae Dei! quam incredibilia sunt judicia ejus!* "O the depth of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how incredible be his judgments!" In like manner the prophet Esay crieth out: *Quomodo facta est meretrix civitas fidelis!* "How is that faithful city become an harlot!"

Antonin.
par. 2. tit. 16.
cap. 1. §. 7.
[Chron. ii.
569.]

Isa. i. 21.

And why might not pope Joan, being a woman, have as good right and interest unto the *see of Rome*, as afterward had pope John XIII. who, being pope, had wicked company with two of his own sisters : or others, whom for their horrible vices and wickedness Platina calleth, *Monstra, et portenta* ? “ Monsters against kind, and ill-shapen creatures ? ” Luitprandus saith, as it is before reported : *Lateranense palatium nunc est prostibulum meretricum* : “ The pope’s palace of Lateran in Rome is now become a stew of whores.”

In Epist. Othonis Imper. per. ad Johan. pp.

Platin. in Johan. 13.

Luitprand. lib. 6. cap. 6.

All this notwithstanding, saith Antoninus : *Nulli ex hoc salutis præjudicium fuit : quia nec ecclesia tunc fuit sine capite, quod est Christus, unde percipit influxum gratiæ* : “ No man had hinderance of salvation by mean hereof.

Antonin. par. 2. tit. 16. cap. 1. §. 7. [Chron. ii. 569.]

For” (although the pope were a woman, yet) “ the church was not without a head. For that head is Christ, from whom she receiveth influence of grace.” Yea, although Antichrist get himself into the *see of Rome*, yet shall the church of God nevertheless continue still : although in horrible confusion, and under great persecution.

Further ye say : “ To Athens was she brought, saith the fable. And why ? For learning. Very well. Whereas at that time neither any Athens stood, nor was there any place of learning there any longer : but all the country of Attica became barbarous, as we understand by the writers of that time.”

“ The city of Athens was then overthrown,” ye say, “ and learning there utterly decayed. And therefore all this is but a fable.” And good reason it is, that we believe you, for that your Onuphrius hath so told you. But for your credit’s sake, M. Harding, lest all men espy your vanity, tell us, by whom was that noble, and so populous, and mighty city of Athens thus laid waste ? by what king ? by what captain ? by what foreign nation ? at what time ? how long ago ? Having not one poor *author* to allege, no not so much as one, how could ye pretend the names of so many without blushing ?

The city of Athens had then continued well near twelve hundred years : and for knowledge in philosophy, and re-

Lumen et
Μουσείον
Ἑλλάδος.

Ruffinus in
Apologia pro
Origene :
apud Hieron.
tom. iv. [ed.
Ben. v. p.
251.]

Georgius Pa-
triarcha in
vita Johan-
nis. [ed. Sav.
vol. viii. p.
161.]

Ruffin. lib. 2.
[leg. lib. xi.]
cap. 9.

M. Harding's
Amphilochi-
us. [p. 350.]

Theodoric.
lib. i. in Epist.
ad Boethium.

[Cassiodor.
Varior. p.
43.]

It appeareth
in the Sub-
scriptions of
the 2. Nicene
Council, ann.
742.

noun of learning, was called the *eye and university of all Græcia*. Origen writeth of himself, that he was sometime a student in Athens. Chrysostom being eighteen years old, for learning's sake, was sent to Athens. St. Basil and his brother Gregory, afterward the bishop of Nyssa, were students at Athens together thirteen years. Your own Amphilochius, whose authority ye may not in any wise deny, saith thus of St. Basil: *Apprehendit matrem literarum Athenas*: "*He came to Athens, which is the mother of learning.*" Boetius of Rome planted himself in Athens, for learning's sake, about the year of our Lord 520.

In the year of our Lord 680, the bishop of Athens was present at the council holden at Constantinople, called *synodus sexta*. After that, in the year of our Lord 742, at the second council of Nice, a great number of the bishops of Græcia were present in their persons all together. Within few years after which time followed pope Joan, in the year of our Lord 853.

Hitherto the whole country and church of Græcia continued in safety: and the emperors of Christendom made their continual abode in those parts. And have you, M. Harding, so suddenly thrown down all together, both church, country, town, and castle, only to keep pope Joan from her study?

Ye say: "The whole country of Attica was then become barbarous." This tale is your own, and hangeth only upon your own credit. Yet Platina, Sabellicus, and others mo, that wrote this story, and knew what they wrote, were not so *barbarous*. But *barbarous* is he, M. Harding, that will believe your simple word without warrant.

"At that time," ye say, "the city of Athens was not standing." But Paulus Æmilius saith, that long after that time, in the reign of Philip the French king, Gottofredus, one of the house of Tricasses, was appointed and made *dux Athenarum, et princeps Achaïæ*: "*the duke of Athens, and the prince of Achaïa.*" If there had been then no Athens standing at that time, as you tell us, how then could Gottofredus have been made *duke of Athens*? If ye say, as ye may do much by your conjectures, that, notwith-

Paulus Æmi-
lius, lib. 6.
Ann. Dom.
1220. [fol.
cxxx. l. 87.]

standing the city of Athens were rased, and made waste, yet the dignity or name of honour remained still, yet will the same Æmilius once again reprove your error. For, writing afterward of certain *pirates* that had invaded the country of Græcia, he saith thus: *In terram Atticam delati, Athenarum ducem Brennæ nobilitatis virum occiderunt, urbemque ceperunt*: “Invading the country of Attica, they took and slew the duke of Athens, one of the house of Brennus, and took the city.”

In the year of our Lord 1206, Michael Choniates, brother unto Nicetas Choniates, was the bishop of Athens: Nicephorus Gregoras, about the year of our Lord 1300, maketh mention of sundry dukes of Athens: Leonycus Chalcocondyla saith, that one Izaulus, a young gentleman of Italy, married the duchess of Athens, and got the city: and that the rest of the Grecians levied their powers against the Athenians: and that afterward, about the year of our Lord 1440, Mahomet the emperor of Turkey took the city of Athens, and subdued it unto himself, and having it in possession, marvelled at the beauty of the castle, and at the force of the walls.

These things happened, as it is easy to reckon, many hundred years after the time of pope Joan. Now therefore, I beseech you, M. Harding, consider indifferently with yourself: if there had been no city of Athens then standing, how could these *pirates* then, how could Izaulus, how could Mahomet, invade and take the city of Athens? shall we say, they levied an army, and disquieted the country, and troubled themselves, and came so far to catch a shadow?

Thus hitherto it appeareth not, but if dame Joan would have gone to Athens, there was room sufficient to receive her.

After that she came to Rome, and there professed learning openly. “This,” you say, “is soon confuted as false. For there was no learning at those days professed at Rome, as the stories do declare.” This is very soon confuted, M. Harding, and specially by him that reckoneth so little what ye say. “The stories,” you say, “do declare it.”

Paulus Æmilius, lib. 8. An. Dom. 1288. [fol. clxxi. l. 87.]

Nicetas, pa. 74. [p. 298.]

Nicephorus Gregor. lib. 4. & 6. [lib. 7.]

Chalcocon. lib. 4. [p. 112.]

Chalcocon. lib. 7. [leg. lib. 6. p. 170.]

Chalcocon. lib. 9. [p. 242.]

Leave, leave this hypocrisy : dissemble no more : it is not manly. Tell us in good sooth, what writers, what stories declare these things. Your credit faileth overmuch. Your word is no sufficient warrant.

No univer-
sity in Rome.

Ye say : " There was no learning in those days professed in Rome." And why so ? will ye now say of Rome, as ye erst said of Athens ? will ye say, there was no city of Rome then standing ? will ye say, *learning* there was then utterly decayed, and the whole *country become barbarous* ? if there were no study nor place of *learning* then in Rome, where then was there any study in all Christendom ? For the *universities of Paris, Orleance, Toulouse, Salerne, Padua, Bononia, Praga, Salamanca, were erected long afterward*. And therefore ye seem to say, that all the whole world then was *barbarous*.

Hieron, in
Appendice
Annalium
Eusebii.
[et in Erasm.
vit. Hieron.]

Hieron, in
Catalogo
Scriptor.
Illustrium.
[iv. pt. 2. p.
125.]

But that ye may the better see your oversight, St. Hierom, writing of Victorinus and Donatus, saith thus : "*Victorinus the rhetorician, and Donatus the grammarian, my schoolmasters, are accounted notable in Rome*." And again he saith : *Victorinus, natione Afer, Romæ sub Constantio principe rhetoricam docuit* : "*Victorinus, born in Africa, taught rhetoric in Rome in the time of the emperor Constantius*."

Erasmus in
vita Hieron.

Erasmus, writing the life of St. Hierom, saith thus : *Romam missus est, velut ad primariam eo sæculo tum religionis, tum eruditionis magistram, (liberalibus studiis erudendus : quod ipse declarat enarrans 11. caput Ezechielis ⁴ :)* "*Hierom was sent to Rome, as to the principal schoolmistress in those days, both of religion, and also of learning, as he himself declareth, expounding the eleventh chapter of Ezekiel*." St. Augustine saith : *Egisti mecum, O Deus, ut mihi persuaderetur Romam pergere, et potius ibi docere quod docebam Carthagine* : " O God, thou movedst my mind to go to Rome, and there rather to profess openly the same learning, that I had professed at Carthage." And further he saith : *Audiebam quietius studere ibi adolescentes, et ordinatiore disciplinæ correctione [al. coercitione] sedari* :

Augustin.
Confess. lib.
5. cap. 8. [1.
113.]

⁴ [The words in parenthesis are not found in the passage quoted.]

"I heard say, that young men there went more quietly to their books, and were kept in orderly obedience to their studies."

And in the *Tripartite work* joined unto the council of Lateran, ye may find the story hereof recorded thus: *Primo Athenis Romam translatum est studium philosophicum: deinde Roma Parisios tempore Caroli, ut dicunt historiæ*: "First the study of philosophy was translated from Athens to Rome: and afterward, as the stories say, in the time of the emperor Charles, it was translated from Rome to Paris."

What shall I more say? The pope himself in his own Decretals saith: "*Rome is an university.*" These be his words: *Curia Romana habet studium generale, et ejus privilegia*: "*The court of Rome hath an universal study, and the privileges of the same.*" And again, pope Clemens saith: *In studiis Romanæ curiæ, Parisiis, Oxonii, Bononiæ, Salamancæ debent esse professores linguarum, Hebraicæ, Chaldaicæ, Arabicæ*: "In the universities of Rome, of Paris, of Oxford, of Bononie, and of Salamanca, there must be professors of the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Arabic tongues."

To be short, Theodoricus Niemus, sometime the pope's secretary, and therefore having good cause to know the truth hereof, and, for ought that I know, having no cause to dissemble, of this whole matter writeth thus: *Et nunc est titulus cardinalis prædictæ scholæ. Et olim in ea legébantur septem artes liberales, et præcipue rhetorica: et etiam in ea legit quandoque beatus Augustinus, et Johannes vocatus de Anglia. Et fuit mulier de Maguntia nata, quæ studuit Athenis sub virili habitu: et in tantum profecit in artibus, ut tandem veniens Romam, per biennium in eadem schola artes liberales legerit: et adeo sufficiens fuit, ut etiam majores et nobiliores urbis ejus lectiones frequenter audierint. Et postea in papam eligitur, &c.*: "Even now a cardinal beareth the title of the said school, or university of Rome. And in old times the seven liberal sciences, and specially rhetoric, were read in the same. There also sometime read St. Augustine, and one that was called John

In Opere
Trip. lib. 2.
cap. 10.
[Crabb. tom.
ii. p. 992.]

In Sexto. de
Privilegiis,
lib. 4. [leg.
lib. 5. tit. 7.
cap. 2.] Cum
de diversis.
Clemens, lib.
5. [tit. 1.
cap. 1.]
De Magistris.

Theodoric.
Niemus.
Citatur ab
Illyr. in Testi-
bus veritatis.
[no. 142. p.
240.]

of England. This John was a woman, born at Mens" (in Germany), "and had studied at Athens in the apparel of a man: and had so profited in the arts, that at last coming to Rome, two years together she professed the liberal sciences in the same school. And her gift in teaching was such, that the elders and nobles of the city resorted often to hear her read. Afterward she was chosen pope," &c.

Thus many ways, M. Harding, have we found an *university or school in Rome*: and no cause to the contrary, but dame Joan, being so well learned as it is said, might well be a reader there.

The pope's
time of tra-
vail.

But ye say: "Why kept she not herself in?" Her midwife might better answer this question. But what if she were suddenly prevented before her time, as many be? or, what if God would have such a matter so openly known, to the everlasting detestation either of the person, or of the place? Certainly Antoninus the archbishop of Florence, being astoned with the horror hereof, as it is said before, crieth out: "O the depth of the wisdom and knowledge of God! O how unsearchable be his judgments!"

Antonin.
par. 2. tit. 16.
cap. 1. §. 7.
[Chron. ii.
509.]

Ut asseritur.

"The author hereof," say you, "durst not to avouch the matter for an undoubted truth: but only saith, *ut asseritur*, 'as it is said:' and so referreth all the whole to hearsay." Notwithstanding, M. Harding, many there be, that write this story as a certain truth, without doubting or credit of hearsay. And Platina, albeit he would not seem to avouch over much, for the honour of the see of Rome, yet thus he saith: *Quod fere omnes affirmant*: "Which thing in a manner all men do affirm." And Ravisius Textor saith: *Scilum est ex chronicis, et a majoribus scriptum*: "It is known by the chronicles, and written by our elders." "It is known," saith one: "It is affirmed in a manner by all men," saith another. But for the space of eight hundred years and more, there was no writer, I trow, so impudent, that would condemn it for a fable, as you do, and utterly deny it to be true.

Platina in
Johan. 8.

In Officina.
[p. 138.]

The marble
image.

Touching the *marble image, representing a woman in child-bearing, and the pope's sudden breaking off his way in his solemn procession*, let each man weigh these things as

him listeth. But where ye compare that *image* to one of the great rag stones at Stonage, or Long Compton, as if it were utterly unwrought, and without shape, ye seem wilfully to avouch, as your manner is, a great untruth. Verily Theodoricus Niemus, the pope's secretary, saith :

Et adhuc vetus statua marmorea illic posita, figurative monstrat (hoc factum). Unde summi pontifices, dum ad Lateranum de basilica principis apostolorum, et contra Theodoricus Niemus, [Inter Flac. Illyr. Test. Veritatis, No. 142. p. 240.]
radunt, illud iter rectum non faciunt. Imo per alias vias per indirectum transeunt, illud aliquantulum prolongando :

“Even unto this day an old marble image there erected, under a figure sheweth this matter. Therefore the popes, when they pass from *St. Peter's church to Lateran*, or backward, they take not their journey straight forth, but pass undirectly by other streets, making their way somewhat the longer.” Lest they should be forced to their shame to behold that image. This therefore is not an old wife's dream, as you say, but the judgment of sundry the wisest and best learned in Rome, who might best know the matter.

As for the *chair of porphyry stone*, which otherwheres ye call the *chair of ease*, it is too vile to be answered. Sabellius saith : *Spectatur adhuc in pontificia domo marmorea sella, circa medium inanis : qua novus pontifex continuo ab ejus creatione residet : ut sedentis genitalia ab ultimo diacono attrectentur.* The hollow chair. Sabellius Ennead. 9. lib. 1.

But let *truth* be *falsehood* : and let *stories* be *fables*. Yet, M. Harding, it may please you to remember, that the same *fable* was raised first in Rome, and from thence only, and from no place else, was published abroad into the world. But let the pope's own *secretaries*, and all the people there be deceived : and, to shadow the shame of that see, let Rome itself be the *mother of lies*. Let no man know the certain truth of matters, but only Onuphrius the pope's parasite, and M. Harding. Yet neither would so many *chronicles* have recorded, nor would the whole world so universally have believed these things of the pope, more than of any other bishop, had there not been wonderful

corruption of manners, and dissolution of life, and open horror, and filthiness in that *only see* above all others.

Testimonies
for the proof
of pope Joan.

Howbeit, good Christian reader, that thou mayest well and clearly understand, that our dealing herein is plain and simple, and that we have not imagined these matters, or any parcel thereof ourselves, may it please thee to read Platina in Johanne 8 : Sabellicus, Enneadis 9. lib. 1 : Leonicus Chalcocondyla, a Greek writer, lib. 6 : Marianus Scotus, that lived about the year of our Lord 1028 : Sigibertus Gemblacensis, that lived about the year of our Lord 1100 : Martinus Polonus, the pope's penitentiary, whom M. Harding so much defaceth, that lived about the year of our Lord 1320 : Ravisius Textor in Officina, cap. *Fœminæ habitum virilem mentitæ* : Antoninus the archbishop of Florence, part. 2. tit. 16 : Volaterranus, Naclerus, Carion, Constantinus Phrygio, Christianus Massæus, Matthæus Palmerius Florentinus, Anselmus Rid, Johannes Parisiensis, cap. 20, *Supplementum Chronicorum*, *Chronica Chronicorum*, *Fasciculus Temporum*, and others mo. Of these some lived four hundred, some five hundred years ago : and have ever been counted worthy of some authority : notwithstanding, for your dame Joan's sake, you, M. Harding, begin now to clip their credit. Howbeit, whatsoever they were, certain it is, they were no Lutherans. All these with one consent agree together, that *dame Joan was pope of Rome*.

Hermaphroditus.

Notwithstanding, some of your own fellows of Louvain could have taught you to have dealt herein more discreetly : and not so precisely and peremptorily to have denied the whole story : specially being sent to you from your friends in Rome, and confirmed by so many. And therefore one of your Louvanians would seem handsomely to excuse and shift the matter by possibility of nature. For thus he saith in effect : *What if the pope were Hermaphroditus, an Herkinalson, that is to say, a man and a woman both in one?* or, if this help will not serve, he seemeth further to say : *What if the pope, being first a man, were afterward changed into a woman?* And thus for want of better

divinity, he forceth Ovid's Metamorphoses to serve the turn. If ye would have taken this man's advice, out of doubt with such a pretty *what if*, ye might soon have put us out of countenance. His words be these: *Neque ego hic quicquam dico de Hermaphroditis, et ἀνδρογύνους, de quibus veterum libri pleni sunt. Et ne a nostri temporis memoria longius abeam, non ignoro, monumentis literarum esse traditum, mulierem quandam nomine Æmyliam, Antonio Spensæ civi Ebulano nuptam, post duodecimum a nuptiis annum in virum transisse. Legi etiam alteram mulierem, ubi puerum peperisset, in marem fuisse mutatam*: "I will here say nothing of such persons as be called *Hermaphroditi*, and are both man and woman, all in one: whereof in old writers we find much mention. But not to go further than to the remembrance of our own time, I know it is written, that a certain woman named *Æmylia*, married unto one *Antonius Spensa*, a citizen of *Ebulum*, ten years after she had been married, was turned into a man. I have likewise read of another woman, that, when she had been brought abed, *afterward became a man*." These notable stories he allegeth, to answer the matter of pope Joan. Thus he thinketh it a great deal the safer way to make the pope an *Herkinalson*, or by miracle to turn him from a man into a woman, than simply and plainly to confess that ever dame Joan was pope in Rome.

If you had taken this same way, then all this story had been a *fable*, and a woman had been a man: and we had utterly been confounded.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 2. *Divis.* 1.

But what need we rehearse *concubines* and *bawds*? For that is now an ordinary and a gainful sin in Rome. For harlots sit there nowadays, not as they did in times past, without the city walls, and with their faces hid and covered: but they dwell in palaces, and fair houses: they stray about in court and market, and that with bare and open face: as

Copus Dial.
1. p. 47.

[Vol. iv. p.
36.]

Gen. xxxviii.
13.
Concil. De-
lect. Cardi-
nal. Concill.
tom. iii.

who would say, they may not only lawfully do it, but ought also to be praised for so doing. What should we say any more of this? Their vicious and abominable life is now thoroughly known to the whole world. Bernard writeth roundly and truly of the bishop of Rome's house, yea, and of the *bishop of Rome* himself. "Thy palace," saith he, "taketh in good men, but it maketh none: naughty persons thrive there, and the good decay⁵." And whosoever he were which wrote the *Tripartite work*, annexed to the council of Lateran, he saith thus: "So excessive at this day is the riot, as well in the prelates and bishops, as also in the clerks and priests, that it is horrible to be told." But these things be not only grown in ure, and so by custom and continuance of time well allowed, as all the rest of their doings in manner be, but they are now waxen old, and rotten ripe. For who hath not heard, what a heinous act Peter Aloisius, pope Paul the Third's son, committed against Cosmus Cherius the bishop of Fanum: what John Casa, archbishop of Beneventum, the pope's legate at Venice, wrote in the commendation of a most abominable filthiness: and how he set forth with most loathsome words, and wicked eloquence, the matter, which ought not once to proceed out of anybody's mouth? to whose ears hath it not come, that Alphonsus Diazius, a Spaniard, being purposely sent from Rome into Germany, so shamefully and devilishly murdered his own brother John Diazius, a most innocent and a most godly man, only because he had embraced

Bernard, de
Consider. ad
Eugen. [i.
445.]

Op. Tripart.
[lib. 3. cap. 7.
Crabb. tom. 1.
ii. p. 1002.]

[Sleidan, lib.
xix.]

⁵ [Bernard. "Nos in monasteria omnes recipimus spe meliorandi: et curia bonos facilius recipere, quam facere consuevit.

"Quod si plures in ea defecisse bonos, quam malos profecisse probavimus, &c.]

the gospel of Jesus Christ, and would not return again to Rome?

But it may chance, to this they will say: These things may sometime happen in the best governed commonwealths, yea and against the magistrates' wills: and besides, there be good laws made to punish such. I grant, it be so: but by what good laws, I would know, have these great mischiefs been punished amongst them? Petrus Aloisius, after he had done that notorious act that I speak of, was always cherished in his father's bosom, pope Paul the Third, and made his very dearling. Diazius, after he had murdered his own brother, was delivered by the pope's means, to the end he might not be punished by good laws. John Casa the archbishop of Beneventum is yet alive, yea and liveth at Rome, even in the eye and sight of the most *holy father*.

M. HARDING.

.....Courtesans went abroad so as the matrons do: some rode on mules, some dwelled in goodly houses. Which particular disorders ^aas there they continued not many years, ^aso in these days they have been reformed.....Wherein ye follow the father of your heresies, and schoolmaster of your malice, the devil, who in scripture is called, *Accusator fratrum nostrum*: "The accuser of our brethren."

a Untruths,
great and
notorious.

Rev. xii. 10.

But sirs, how leap ye from Rome to Placentia, from the clergy to a temporal duke, whom ye call the pope's son, though he was not his son being pope, but by lawful matrimony before holy orders taken? For such a one was Peter Aloisius, of whom ye speak. Be it, that he was an evil man, what maketh that against the church? what for defence of your new gospel? If Johannes Casa, being yet a young springall, before he came to be a clerk, and long before he was either bishop or legate, made certain amorous sonnets in Italian rhyme, following the Italian poet Petrarcha, to which kind of exercise the good wits of Italy in youth are much given, and, without naming any person, flatteringly smoothed that heinous fact, rather than praised: wherein nevertheless he did evil, we confess, and, for the same oversight of his youth, was (notwithstanding his other excellent qualities) kept

O, a fair
boongrace,
to beautify
open and
known wick-
edness.

Johan. Casa.

b Untruth.
For we tell
no lie. Read
the answer.

back from the dignity of cardinalship during his life: all this being granted and considered, what hindereth it the estimation of Christ's church? and what furthereth it your false doctrine, your schisms, and your heresies?—Touching the death of John Diazius the Spaniard, ye tell ^b many lies at once⁶.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Johan. Sleidan, lib. 19.

We leaped not so lightly to Placentia, M. Harding, but rather rest at Verona, and say the truth⁷. For pope Paulus, that should have punished his wicked son, and have burnt him to death for his abominable outrage, removed not to Placentia, but remained still in Rome. Johannes Sleidanus saith, that the young gentleman, the bishop of Fanum, upon whom Petrus Aloisius, *the pope's son*, had shewed that horrible villainy, shortly after died for shame and heaviness. "Yet," he saith, "*it is thought of some, that Petrus Aloisius, after his wicked act committed, gave him poison, and so killed him, lest he should make complaint thereof unto the emperor.*" He addeth further: *Paulus nihilo secius impense amabat filium: et ad ipsius amplificationem omne studium convertit. Et cum de ejus flagitiis nonnunquam audiret, fertur non admodum ægre tulisse: et hoc solum consuevisse dicere, Hæc illum vitia non se commostrate didicisse:* "Pope Paul nevertheless favoured his son above measure: and bestowed all his care to increase him in honour. And whereas he heard sometime of his shameful acts, the report is, that he was not much offended therewith: but used only thus to say, Well, *yewiss he never learned these vices by my example.*" So cruel and terrible is the pope in repressing of sin.

Johan. Sleidan, lib. 19.

But God of his justice would not suffer such abomination to escape unpunished. Certain of the nobles of his own city, not long after, arose against him, and slew him in his own palace, and hung out his vile carcase in shameful sort by a chain over the walls: and afterward threw it over into the moat. The people of all sorts ran gladly to the sight: and stabbed him in on every side with their daggers: and trod him filthily under their feet.

⁶ [Here follows a long account of the story of John Diazius.]

⁷ [This play of words occurs before.]

Ye say: "The particular disorders of your courtesans in these days at the last have been reformed." And yet by very credible report, even within these two years, which was in the year of our Lord 1565, by a perfect view taken, there were found in Rome to the number of eight and twenty thousand women of that sort. If this be the *reformation of the church of Rome*, what was it then before it was thus reformed?

As for that most horrible book of Johannes Casa, so vile, and so loathsome, that no heathen ears could abide to hear it, O how favourably, and how friendly it is excused! "He was then," ye say, "but a young man: but a spring-all: no bishop: no clerk: he named no person: it was but a kind of exercise: an oversight: an amorous sonnet: the good wits of Italy be much given to it: he praised not that fault, but only smoothed it." O, M. Harding, what abomination is there under heaven, but ye can devise ways, how to smooth it?

"But he was punished," ye say, "full sore for his oversight. For he could never be made cardinal during his life." Yea, good M. Harding: and all this must we believe, because you speak it. The pope made him the *archbishop of Beneventum*, and *legate a latere*, and thereby one of his *secret council*, in part of this cruel punishment. But though he, upon that or some other occasion, were kept back from being *cardinal*, yet were there others made *cardinals*, in all respects as bad as he. Read Andreas Alciatus, that notable *civilian*, and ye shall find what a minion was made bishop of Comum, when Paulus Jovius was put beside. Read Paulus Jovius in the life of Cle-
Andr. Alciatus in Epist. prefixa Historie Pauli Jovii.
 mens VII. and learn what pretty folks then were made *cardinals*, and for what causes. As for your own Onuphrius, he speaketh parables, and casteth colours, and would seem to mean more hereof, than he durst to utter.
Paulus Jovius. [tom. ii. 129. G.]
Onuphrius in Julio 3.

The emperor Tiberius sometime placed Novellius Tricongius in most high and honourable room, and made him *proconsul*, in part of recompense for his good service, for that he was able to drink three pottles of wine together
Sueton. Tranquill. in Tiberio. [cap. 42.]
Tricongium uno Spiritu.

with one breath⁷. This was not the worthiest cause of promoting such magistrates to such a room: yet was there more honour and honesty in this cause of preferment, than hath been thought to be in the preferring of sundry *cardinals*.

Johan. Sleidan. lib. 17. ann. 1546.

Touching the murdering of Johannes Diazius, by his own brother Alphonsus, wherein ye say, "we have told you so many lies at once," we refer ourselves to the story thereof truly written by Johannes Sleidanus, the effect whereof in short is this: One Johannes Diazius, *a Spaniard, and a doctor of Sorbona in Paris*, after that God had given him grace to understand the truth of the gospel, departed from thence, and came into Germany, and rested at Neuberg, in the dominion of Otho Henricus county palatine. His brother Alphonsus Diazius, being then in Rome, and understanding hereof, immediately took horses, and with all speed came into Germany, minding to withdraw his brother from his purpose. And finding him constant and steadfast, and not likely any ways to be removed, in the end he feigned himself, by the weight of his reasons, to be persuaded to the same religion: and desired him to return with him into Italy, for that he should do more good there, than he could in Germany. But seeing him for sundry causes firmly bent to stay there, he took his leave, and departed thence, and exhorted him to continue constant in the truth, and came to Augusta, six Dutch miles from Neuberg. The next day, as having forgotten some special matter he had to say to his brother, he returned back again from thence to Neuberg, and by the way bought a carpenter's axe, and entering into the town, upon the 27th of March, he came to his brother's lodging in the break of the day, and himself watching beneath, sent up his servant with the axe to do the deed. The servant, after he had called forth Johannes Diazius, and had delivered him a

⁷ [Suetonius: "Ignotissimum "amphoram." In an ed. 1548, "quæsturæ candidatum nobilissimis anteposuit, ob epotam in to *Tricongium*—but the leaf is "convivio, propinante se, vini torn out. See Hoffman Lexicon.]

letter from his brother Alphonsus, and saw him turned towards the light to read the same, came suddenly behind him, and stroke him in the head with his axe, and leaving it sticking in the wound, came away together with Alphonsus his master. This is the very true story hereof, M. Harding, and in all these words there is no lie. "Touching your courtesans," ye say, "the pope of late hath made a general reformation. For now they are both removed from their fair palaces wherein they dwelt, and also put from their mules." As if the fault had been only in their mules, or houses, and not rather in their whole trade of life. Certainly, the same women continue still, even in the city of Rome, and that unto the number of eight and twenty thousand, as it is said before. *Such is the reformation of the church of Rome.*

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 3. Divis. 1. and 2.

They have killed infinite numbers of our brethren, only because they believed truly and sincerely in Jesus Christ. But of that great and foul number of harlots, fornicators, adulterers, what one have they at any time (I say not put to death), but either excommunicate, or once attached? why? voluptuousness, adultery, ribawdry, whoredom, murdering of kin, incest, and others more abominable parts, are not they counted sin at Rome? or, if they be sin, ought *Christ's vicar, Peter's successor, the most holy father*, so lightly and slily to bear them, as though they were no sin, and that in the city of Rome, and in that principal tower of all holiness? *O holy scribes and Pharisees*, which never knew this kind of holiness! *O what a holiness, what a catholic faith is this!* Peter did not thus teach at Rome: Paul did not so live at Rome: they did not practise brothelry, as these do openly: they made not a yearly revenue and profit of harlots: they suffered no common adul-

terers and wicked *murderers* to go unpunished. They did not receive them into⁸ their familiarity, into their counsel, into their household, nor yet into the company of Christian men. These men ought not therefore so unreasonably to triumph against our living. It had been more wisdom for them, either first to have proved good their own life before the world, or, at the least, to have cloaked it a little more cunningly. For we do use still the old and ancient laws, and (as much as men may do, in the manners used at these days, all things being so wholly corrupt) we diligently and earnestly put in execution the ecclesiastical discipline: we have not common brothel houses of strumpets, nor yet flocks of concubines, nor herds of harlot haunters: neither do we prefer adultery before matrimony: neither do we exercise beastly sensuality: neither do we gather ordinary rents and stipends of stews: nor do we suffer incest and abominable naughtiness, not yet such Aloisians, Casians, and Diazians to escape unpunished. For if these things would have pleased us, we needed not to have departed from these men's fellowship, amongst whom such enormities be in their chief pride and price. Neither needed we, for leaving them, to run into the hatred of men, and into most wilful dangers.

[Sleidan.
contin. ann.
1559.]

Paul the Fourth, not many months sithence, had at Rome in prison certain Augustine *friars*, many bishops, and a great number of other devout men, for religion's sake. He racked them, and tormented them: to make them confess, he left no means unassayed. But in the end, how many brothels, how many whoremongers, how many adulterers,

⁸ [Apol. Lat. "in sinum."]

how many incestuous persons could he find of all those?

M. HARDING.

This ye deny as impudently, as ye affirmed the other matter of Diazius falsely..... Wherefore what punishment is due to slanderers, that ought this defender to have for this false slander..... Then cometh me your secretary and praiseth himself, and all you his holy companions, besides all wit and modesty. And saith much in commendation of your ministership's goodness, for that ye keep and use still the old and ancient laws, forsooth, and discipline of the church.....

For shame, for conscience, for regard of the world, for fear of God's wrath, for avoiding everlasting fire, return to the catholic church from whence ye are broken out like the fat bulls of Basan, put away your most unlawful yoke-fellows. Leave yourselves to be abominable, before with such spiteful railing ye reprehend our a *infirmity*⁹.....

A brave and a lusty kind of eloquence. a Fornication, open stews, and incest, are M. Harding's *infirmities*.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 3. *Divis. 3.*

[Vol. iv. p. 38.]

Our God be thanked, although we be not the men we ought, and profess to be, yet whosoever, and whatsoever we be, compare us with these men, and even our own life and innocency will soon prove untrue, and condemn their malicious surmises. For we exhort the people to all virtue and well doing, not only by books and preachings, but also by our examples and behaviour. We also teach, that the gospel is not a boasting or bragging of knowledge, but that it is the law of life, and that a Christian man, as Tertullian saith, "ought not to speak honourably, but ought to live honourably: nor that they be the hearers of the law, but the doers of the law, which are justified before God."

Apologet. c. 45.

M. HARDING.

Nay, nay, sirs, for that thing ye crake so much of, be not too hasty to thank your God. What peculiar God ye mean, we know not. That phrase your secretary much useth, as though

⁹ [Harding denies the fact that the Augustine friars were racked.]

Is this the
modesty of
the Spirit of
God?

ye had another God beside him that is God of all. Compare yourselves with whom ye list, your own life and innocency is so well known, as by reproving your vices and horrible sins, no man lightly shall seem a slanderer. Indeed if your continual ad-voutery and incest were lawful matrimony, if your filthy yoke-fellows were your true wedded wives, if your robbing and throwing down of churches were almose, and building of places for prayer to the increase of God's honour, if ignorant rashness were godly discretion, if your word of the Lord were God's word, if your pretended gospel were Christ's true gospel, if your bible-babble and railing were wholesome preaching, if the spirit of Satan that is in you, the same also being a lying spirit in your mouths, could be meek, humble, obedient, and would tell truth, finally if evil were good, if darkness were light, if sour were sweet, if the fruits of your so naughty a tree were good, we would also sooth you, and uphold your immoderate crakes. We say plainly of you at one word, which we will to be a watchword for all Christian people to beware of you, your doctrine is heresy, your life is iniquity, your endeavour tendeth to the subversion of souls.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

It is no great *crake*, M. Harding, to give God thanks. But what uncourteous dealing is this of your part? *Sir defender and his fellows* must come to you, and learn to speak. Notwithstanding, for ought that may appear, ye are not yet very well advised, how to speak yourself. Now, because we say, *we thank our God*, our *secretary* hath made himself a *several God*. Howbeit, you may say *our Lord*, and think him not catholic that will say otherwise: and yet make you not yourselves thereby any *several Lord*. God give you grace, ye be not severed from the Lord. But wherefore it should be more lawful for you to say *our Lord*, than for us to say *our God*, I think it a high point of cunning for you to open.

Thus ye would have us sometimes to say *our Lord*, sometimes *the Lord*, sometimes neither. It were a skillful cook, that knew your diet. Howbeit, the prophet David saith: *Deus noster refugium et virtus*: "Our God, our refuge, and our strength." Sing psalms unto *our God*: *our God* is the God of salvation: "*Our God* is in heaven:" "*My God*, O *my God*, I wake early unto thee:" thou art *my God*: "I trust in thee:" "*My lots* are in thy hands."

Psal. xlii. 1.

Psal. lxiv.

Psal. cxlii. 5.

Psal. lxxiii. 1.

Psal. xv. 2.

Psal. lxxvii. 6.

St. Paul saith: "I thank *my God* always:" "I give thanks 1 Cor. i. 4. & xiv. 18. Philipp. i. 3. unto *my God*." Thus was it lawful then for the apostles and prophets to speak without rebuke: neither was there any M. Harding, then, so uncourteous, to say, *They made themselves a peculiar God*.

St. Paul saith: "We are justified in the name of Jesus 1 Cor. vi. 11. Christ our Lord, and in the Spirit of our God." St. Augustine saith: *Contra istos.....mirabiliarios cautum me fecit Deus meus, dicens, In novissimis diebus surgent falsi prophetae*: "My God hath willed me to beware of these mongers of miracles, telling me, 'That in the last days there shall rise up false prophets.'" Again he saith: *Deus meus ubique præsens est: ubique totus: nusquam inclusus*: "My God is every where present: every where whole: nowhere enclosed, or shut up." Chrysostom saith: *Christo meo testificabantur et venti et mare*: "Both the winds and the sea bare witness to my Christ¹⁰." St. Hierom saith: *Ego non patrem, non matrem, non germanum adversus Christum meum audiam*: "I will not hear, neither father, nor mother, nor brother against my Christ." St. Cyprian saith: *Hic est Deus noster, id est, non omnium, sed credentium, et fidelium Deus.....*: "This is our God, that is to say, not the God of all, but the God of the believers, and of the faithful." Sedulius saith: *Deus natura omnium est, voluntate vero paucorum*: "God by nature is the God of all: but by will, he is the God of few." But what shall we need many doctors, the case being so clear? You yourself, M. Harding, in this selfsame *book*, either of purpose upon some better advice, or unawares, have written the same. Consider well your own words: thus ye say: "There is no iniquity in our Lord God." Yet, I trow, by these words, ye make not to yourself a *peculiar God*.

St. Paul saith: "I live in the faith of the Son of God, which hath loved me, and hath given himself for my sake." Which words St. Chrysostom, writing upon the Genesis, expoundeth thus: *Qui dilexit me, &c. Ut proprium usurpas commune beneficium. Profecto, inquit: Nam licet pro omni* Chrysost. in Genesim. hom. 34. [iv. 348.]

¹⁰ [No genuine commentary of is extant; and in the spurious one St. Chrysostom's upon Psalm xvi. this passage is not found.]

hominum genere sacrificium oblatum sit, tamen propter amorem in eum, id quod factum est omnibus, proprium mihi facio. Ita et prophetis mos est, et facere, et dicere, Deus, Deus meus: quamvis totius orbis sit Deus. Sed peculiare hoc est amori, ut ex communibus propria faciat. Qui dilexit me: Quid dicis? an te dilexit solum? Omnem, inquit, hominum naturam dilexit. Sed ego illi gratias debeo, quasi me solum dilexisset, et tradidisset semetipsum pro me solo. "St. Paul saith: 'Christ hath loved me.' O Paul, the benefit, that is common to all, thou usest as peculiar to thyself. Yea verily, saith St. Paul: for, albeit that sacrifice were offered for all mankind, yet for the love that I bear towards him, the thing that was done to all, I account as proper and several to myself alone. Thus the manner of the prophets is to do, and to say, O God, my God: notwithstanding he is the God of all the world. But this is the special and alonely office of love, of things common to make things peculiar. Thou sayest, 'Christ hath loved me.' What sayest thou? hath Christ loved thee only, and no man else? 'No,' saith Paul, 'he hath loved all mankind. But I owe him thanks, as if he had loved me alone, and had given himself only for me.'"

Henceforth, M. Harding, it may please you to give us leave to speak, as the prophets, the apostles, the holy fathers, and doctors have spoken before us.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 4. Divis. 1.

Besides all these matters, wherewith they charge ^[Vol. iv. p. 38.] us, they are wont also to add this one thing, which they enlarge with all kind of spite: that is, that we be men of trouble, that we pluck the *sword and sceptre out of kings' hands*: that we arm the people: that we overthrow judgment-places, destroy the laws, make havoc of possessions, seek to make the people princes, turn all things upside down: and to be short, that we would have nothing in good frame in a commonwealth. Good Lord, how often have

[Tertull. A-pol. cap. 1. 23.]

they set on fire princes' hearts, with these words, to the end they might quench the light of the gospel in the very first appearing of it, and that men might begin to hate the same, ere ever they were able to know it, and to the end that every magistrate might think he saw his deadly enemy, as often as he saw any of us ! Surely it should exceedingly grieve us, to be so maliciously accused of most heinous treason, unless we knew, that Christ himself, the apostles, and a number of good Christian men were in time past blamed and reviled in like sort. For although Christ taught, "they should give unto Cæsar, that which was Cæsar's:" yet was he charged with sedition, and was accused to devise some conspiracy, and to seek ways to get the kingdom. And thereupon they cried out with open mouth against him in the place of judgment: "If thou let this man escape, then thou art not Cæsar's friend."

And though the apostles did likewise evermore and steadfastly teach, that magistrates ought to be obeyed, "that every soul ought to be subject to the higher powers, not only for fear of wrath and punishment, but even for conscience sake," yet bare they the name to disquiet the people, and to stir up the multitude to rebel. After this sort did Haman Esther iii. 8. specially bring the nation of the Jews into the hatred of king Assuerus, because, said he, "they were a rebellious and stubborn people, and despised the ordinances and commandments of princes." Wicked king Ahab said to Elie [*Elijah*] the prophet of God, 1 Kings xviii. 17. "It is thou that troublest Israel." Amasias, the priest at Bethel, laid a conspiracy to the prophet Amos' charge, before king Jeroboam, saying: "See, Amos Amos vii. 10. hath made a conspiracy against thee, in the midst of the house of Israel:" to be brief, Tertullian saith,

Tertull, in
Apologetico.
[cap. 37. p.
30 c.]

This was the general accusation of all Christians, whiles he lived, that they were traitors, that they were rebels, and the enemies of mankind. Wherefore, if nowadays the truth be likewise evil spoken of, and, being the same truth it was then, if it be now like despitefully used, as it was in times past, though it be a grievous and unkind dealing, yet can it not seem unto us a new, or an unwonted matter.

M. HARDING.

a Untruth,
notorious
and manifest
to all the
world.
b These
boors for
the greatest
part were
enemies unto
Luther.

c All this
great multi-
tude of
England and
Scotland
stood only in
two persons.
We know no
mo.

How far ye have attempted (I mean the sects of your brotherhood) in sundry countries, to wrest the sword out of princes' hands, to transpose their sceptres at your pleasure, and to alter states and signories, though we hold our peace, ^a the world judgeth, the blood of so many thousands slain speaketh, England repenteth, Scotland mourneth, Germany roareth, France bewaileth, Savoy weepeth, all Christendom lamenteth. ^b Were the hundred thousand boors of Germany consumed by the sword of the nobility there for their obedience? the duke of Saxony, and Lantgrave of Hesse, were they overthrown in field and taken captive for standing in defence of their sovereign? were so great multitudes of people destroyed at Munster for their loyalty?..... Your sacramentary Suitzers of Berna, who robbed the quiet old duke of Savoy of his towns and countries, from the farther side of the lake of Geneva unto the Alps, did they this for maintenance of his right, and to set him at rest with little? what meant ye, when ye laid your heads together, being at Geneva in queen Mary's days, the faithful ^c brothers of England and Scotland, and devised a most seditious and traiterous book against the monstrous regiment of women ¹¹?.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here, M. Harding, for want of matter, ye thought it good policy, to furnish your tale with store of words: "The world judgeth: blood speaketh: England repenteth: Scotland mourneth: Germany roareth: France bewaileth: Savoy weepeth: Christendom lamenteth." If ye had not well studied your *copia verborum*, ye could never have been half so copious, nor have been able so many ways to utter nothing. Ye might haply have said, Your cardinals cry, and your pope roareth, and your friends stand aloof,

¹¹ ["First blast against the monstrous regiment of women," by John Knox, A. D. 1556.]

and tear their hair, and say, as it is written in the Apocalypse: *Væ, væ Babylon, civitas illa magna*: “Alas, alas Rev. xviii. 10. Babylon, that great city.”

God be thanked, the kingdoms and princehoods of the world stand now in as safe, and in as quiet and flourishing state, as ever before. Therefore this tragical rhetoric might better have served you some other where.

The boors of Germany, of whom ye speak, for the greatest part, were adversaries unto doctor Luther, and understood no part of the gospel: but conspired together, as they said, only against the cruelty and tyranny of their lords: as they had done two and twenty years before in the same country in the conspiracy called *liga sotularia*, Liga sotularia, anno 1503. D. Luther began to preach anno 1518. fifteen years before doctor Luther began to preach: the partners of which conspiracy had for their watchword the name of *our lady*: and in the honour of her, were bound to say five Ave Marias every day. Certainly, touching these *later rebels*, it is known, that Luther sharply and vehemently wrote against them. And they themselves being demanded thereof, utterly denied both the partaking, and also the knowledge of the gospel. Johan. Sleidan. lib. 4 et 5. Paral. Ursperg. anno 1525.

“The princes of Germany raised not their powers,” as ye say, “against the emperor Charles the Fifth,” but, being wrongfully, and contrary to the law of arms invaded by him, they were forced, being free princes, by the law of nature, to draw their sword in their own defence. Nicol. Gerbellius Phoricensis [l. Pfortshemius.]

The *rebels* at Munster were not gossellers, as ye seem to mean, but frantic Anabaptists, and heretics, as ye be: and therefore enemies unto the gospel.

The lords of Berna never were subjects to the duke of Savoy. That they took certain of his castles in their confines, they did it rightly, and by the law of arms, being forced thereto by daily invasions and robberies, and not able otherwise to live in rest. But indeed the said poor duke was thoroughly spoiled of his whole dominion: of the one half, by his brother-in-law the emperor Charles V., of the other half, by his nephew Francis the French king, by the counsel of pope Clemens VII. after their great interview at Marseilles. And thereof was devised a pretty

pasquil, declaring the miserable case of the poor duke : *Diviserunt sibi vestimenta mea : et super vestem meam miserunt sortem* : “They have divided my apparel amongst themselves : and they have cast lots for my coat.”

“The heads of England and Scotland, that” (as ye say) “were laid together at Geneva, touching the government of women,” being well accounted, were nothing so many as ye would seem to imagine. For if there had been but one less, for ought that I have heard, there had been but one at all¹². Such hot amplifications it liketh you to make of so small a number. We will defend no man in his error. Let every man bear his own guilt. M. Calvin, M. Martyr, M. Musculus, M. Bullinger, and others, whom you call the faithful brothers of England, misliked that enterprise, and wrote against it.

Num. xxvii.
8.

Aug. de Civ.
lib. 3. cap. 21.
[vii. 80.]

We know, that God hath determined this matter long sithence : for thus he saith : *Si homo moriatur absque filio, ad filiam ejus transibit hæreditas* : “If a man die without a son, his inheritance shall pass unto his daughter.” And St. Augustine saith : *Lata est Romæ lex illa Voconia, Ne quis hæredem fœminam faceret, nec unicam filiam. Qua lege quid iniquius dici, aut cogitari possit, ignoro* : “There was a law made in Rome, called *lex Voconia*, that no man should convey his inheritance unto a woman, no not unto his only daughter. Than which law I know not what may be more wickedly thought or spoken.”

But, God be thanked, that of his mercy hath now raised up unto us a woman of such *wisdom, learning, clemency, gravity, judgment, government, and other noble and princely virtues*, as have not been seen in many men. God increase her daily with his Holy Spirit, and make her an old *mother in Israel*. Amen.

Of your *sturdy blasts* and *secret breathings*, M. Harding, I will say nothing. Ye may yet remember, which of your Louvanian company it was, that in the time of that *noble prince of blessed memory*, king Edward the Sixth, said in open parliament, “Woe be to that kingdom, the prince

¹² [Bishop Jewel alludes to John who wrote on the same subject. See Knox and Christopher Goodman, Strype's Annals, vol. i. pt. i. p. 181.]

whereof is a child." And afterward, seeing the queen's majesty that now is, placed in her estate, boldly and openly confessed a great oversight, and much folly in your former doings, for that in the late time of your unruly government, *ye had hewn down the boughs, and left the stock standing still.* God's secret providence, M. Harding, breathed against you, and confounded your doings. Power only ye lacked : but good will ye lacked none.

M. HARDING.

For answer to all this, ye join yourselves with Christ and his apostles, as though ye were guilty herein no more than they. Presumptuously said. But the matter is not so answered. And yet ye run at large in that common place, and very vainly or rather Luciferlike, compare yourselves with the apostles. But sirs, stay here, run no further : ye are soon stopped. The case is not like pardy. These be but your words : " In the apostles was the truth indeed, so was it in the holy prophets, and those first blessed men of the church." The truth, ye boast and crake so much of, is not that truth.....Talk less like rhetoricians, and prove us that ye have truth, like honest men. And then talk on : but that can ye never do, so long as ye remain out of the church, and enemies to the church. ^a But what spend I words in vain ? ^a O vain bravery ! Your hearts be hardened, your eyes be blinded, your ears be stopped.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here is profound stuff, M. Harding, for a doctor of *divinity*. To answer you with your own vain words, indeed *ye spend your words in vain.*

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 4. *Divis.* 2.

Forty years ago, and upward, it was an easy thing for them to devise against us these accursed speeches and other too, sorer than these : when, in the midst of the darkness of that age, first began to spring, and to give shine some one glimmering beam of truth, unknown at that time, and unheard of : when also Martin Luther, and Hulderic Zwinglius, being most excellent men, even sent of God to give light to the whole world, first came unto the knowledge and preaching of the gospel : when as yet the thing

was but new, and the success thereof uncertain : and when men's minds stood doubtful and amazed, and their ears open to all slanderous tales : and when there could be imagined against us no fact so detestable, but the people then would soon believe it, for the novelty and strangeness of the matter. For so did Symmachus, so did Celsus, so did Julianus, so did Porphyrius, the old foes to the gospel, attempt in times past to accuse all Christians of sedition and treason, before that either prince or people were able to know, who those Christians were, what they professed, what they believed, or what was their meaning.

M. HARDING.

As ye run forth your race, and with lying amplification boast and brag of the truth of your doctrine, and of the innocency of your demeanour, ye fall into a great inconvenience and oversight. Was the light extinguished in all Israel, till that lewd friar came, and Zwinglius ^a the swart rutter ? shall we now change the old song of Micheas the prophet, " Out of Sion shall come the law, and the word of our Lord from Jerusalem," and sing a new song, " Out of ^b Wittenberg is come the gospel, and the word of the Lord from Zurich and Geneva ?" If Luther and Zwinglius first came to the knowledge and preaching of the gospel, what meant Christ to break his promise, who said, " I will be with you all days till the end of the world ?"

Again how forgat ye the old proverb, " a liar it behoveth to be mindful ?" Remember ye not, how this is ^c contrary to all your own doctrine ? for say ye not otherwheres, that God had always his number of the elect, and his invisible church ? Therefore this must ye recant and call back again, or else shall ye pull all the rabble of sundry your own sects upon your shoulders, whose filthy railings and vile upbraidings, poor souls, ye shall never be able to abide.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

It is not worth the while to answer him that saith nothing. Sion, from whence ye say the law of God issued first, was in those days as much disdained of your fathers, as is this day of you Geneva or Wittenberg. Origen

^a Untruth, malicious and slanderous. For Zwinglius was a godly preacher, and no rutter.

^b This blasphemy toucheth God's providence. For why not as well from Wittenberg as from Rome ?

^c Untruth, fond and childish. This is M. Harding's sobriety.

saith of Celsus the heathen: *Christianum dogma affirmat a barbaris cepisse ortum, hoc est, a Judæis*: "He saith, that the Christian faith took her first beginning from *barbarous* people, that is to say, from the Jews¹¹." Cicero saith: *Judæi, et Syri, gentes natæ servituti?* "The Jews and Syrians, nations born to bondage."^{Orig. contra Celsum, lib. i. [1. 320.] Cicero de Provin. Consul.}

And Chrysostom, speaking of Julianus the renegade, saith thus: *Galileos nos pro Christianis, in edictis suis appellavit*: "In his proclamations, in the stead of Christians, he called us scornfully *Galileans*:" noting thereby the vileness of the place, from whence the gospel of Christ first proceeded. But Nazianzen saith: *Honora parvam Bethleem, quæ te induxit in paradisum*: (Despise not, but rather) "honour that *little Bethlehem*, that hath led thee into paradise."^{Chrysostom. contra Gentiles. [ii. 575.] Nazianz. de Nat. Christi. [i. 674.] καὶ τὴν Βηθ-λεὲμ τίμησον τὴν μικράν.}

The sound of this simple, *barbarous*, despised people was heard throughout the whole world. "God causeth his light to shine out of the dark:" his Holy Spirit "breatheth where he thinketh good:" he hath "no regard of persons, or choice of places," but, as St. Peter said unto Cornelius, "in every nation, whosoever feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted before him." "God chooseth the weak things of the world to confound the strong." God's holy name be blessed, that of so little and so simple a despised mustard seed hath now raised up so great a tree: and "triumpheth the gospel of Christ his Son in every place throughout the world."^{Psalm xix. 4. John iii. 8. Acts x. 34. Matt. xlii. 32. Cor. i. [1. 2 Cor. ii. 14.]}

"What meant Christ," say you, "to break his promise?" Nay, what meant you, M. Harding, so shamefully to break Christ's commandment, and yet to charge him with his promise? "God is true in all his promises, and shall prevail when he is so lewdly judged." There is no fault in God, or his Christ: the fault is in you, that have made of the "house of God a cave of thieves." Christ never made any such special *promise* unto the *pope*, that whatsoever it should please him to say or do, he should never err,

¹¹ [Origen contr. Cels. 'Εξῆς δόγμα, δηλονότι τὸν Ἰουδαϊσμόν, οὗ βάρβαρον φησιν ἄνωθεν εἶναι τὸ Χριστιανισμὸς ἡρτηται.]

or do amiss. Ye presume over much of God's promises. Nay, though Antichrist should be *pope*, yet should Christ's promises be true still.

It is true, that God hath always a church invisible, and a number of elect, known only to himself alone. Neither
2 Tim. ii. 19. is this our only saying. St. Paul also saith the same: *Firmum stat fundamentum Dei, habens hoc sigillum, Novit Dominus qui sint sui*: "This foundation standeth sound and firm, having this seal, *The Lord knoweth, who be his own.*" Elias thought all the godly in Israel had been slain; and not one left alive. But God said unto him: "I have saved unto myself seven thousand men, that never bowed their knee before Baal." God knew them; but Elias knew them not. To the judgment of man they were *invisible*.
1 Kings xix. 18. Therefore St. Augustine saith: *Secundum occultam Dei*
Rom. xi. 4. *prædestinationem, plurimæ sunt foris oves: plurimi lupi intus. Novit enim, ac signatos habet, qui nec eum, nec se norunt*: "According to God's secret predestination there be many sheep without the church; and many wolves within the church. For he knoweth them, and hath them marked, that know neither themselves nor God neither ¹²."

August. in Johan. tract. 45. [iii. pt. 2. p. 600.]



Addition. As for the whole body and company of ^{Addition.}

all them that be called Christians, reckoned universally together, which you call the *church catholic*, cardinal Cusanus calleth it *ecclesia conjecturalis*; "a church conjectural:" for that we know it, not by certainty, but by *conjecture*. For in this *church*, thus largely taken, they, that seem predestinate before men, are oftentimes wicked and reprobate before God: and they, that before men seem the members of Christ, are oftentimes before God the members of Antichrist. Cusanus' words be these: *Oportet in sensibili mundo sensibilibus signis de ipsa Christi ecclesia conjecturam sumere, cum aliter attingi nequeat rationis veritas, &c.* "In this sensible world that is here beneath, we must learn by sensible tokens to know the very church of Christ: for otherwise we are not able to reach the truth. Therefore this *conjectural church* in this sensible world, according to

Nicol. Cusan. De potest. ecclesie Romanæ, epist. 1. [p. 826.]

¹² [Bishop Jewel probably quoted from memory.]

such a short knowledge as this world may yield, is indeed the true church: notwithstanding, according to the *conjecture* that we gather by tokens, it receive as well the godly that be joined to Christ, as also the ungodly, that be divided from Christ. This church standeth of them, that declare by sensible and outward tokens, that they be partakers of Christ, as they be that confess Christ to be the Son of God. And therefore this church hath certain holy tokens, or sacraments," (as the sacrament of baptism, and the sacrament of our Lord's supper,) "ordained to that end, that thereby we may know them that be of Christ, so far forth, as by such tokens *conjectural knowledge* may be gathered. Therefore I say, that this church of Christ," (in this general taking,) "by this *conjectural judgment*, is counted holy, notwithstanding wicked men and hypocrites cover themselves under the same outward tokens, (*and receive baptism and the Lord's supper*¹³), as well as the godly." Thus the general or outward church of God is *visible*, and may be seen: but the very true church of God's elect is *invisible*, and cannot be seen or discerned by man; but is only known to God alone. ➡

Thus the number of God's elect, yea before the coming of Christ, in the time of darkness, was evermore certain: yet afterward the knowledge of the gospel, by the mouths of the apostles, was abundantly carried abroad into the ends of all the world.

Both these parts, M. Harding, may stand well together, and are nothing contrary to our doctrine. Be the number of the faithful more or less, yet the truth of God is one for ever.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 5. Divis. 1.

But now, sithence our very enemies do see, and cannot deny, but we ever in all our words and writ-

¹³ ["...etiam si mali et ficti
"sub signis sacris se intermis-
"ceant, quorum signa quæ sacra
"sunt tantum conjectura attingit."

The words in parenthesis therefore are not Cusanus', but Jewel's explanation.]

ings have diligently put the people in mind of their duty, to obey their princes and magistrates, yea though they be wicked, (for this doth very trial and experience sufficiently teach, and all men's eyes, who-soever and wheresoever they be, do well see and witness for us,) it was a foul part of them to charge us with these things: and, seeing they could find no new and late faults, therefore to seek to procure us envy only with stale and outworn lies. We give our Lord God thanks, whose only cause this is, there hath yet at no time been any such example in all the realms, dominions, and commonweals, which have received the gospel. For we have overthrown no kingdom: we have decayed no man's power or right: we have disordered no commonwealth. There continue in their own accustomed state, and ancient dignity, the kings of our country of England, the kings of Denmark, the kings of Suecia, the dukes of Saxony, the counties Palatine, the marquisses of Brandenburgh, the landgraves of Hussia, the commonwealth of the Helvetians and Rhotians, and the free cities, as Argentine, Basil, Frankfort, Ulme, Augusta, and Norenburg; do all, I say, abide in the same authority and estate, wherein they have been heretofore, or rather in a much better; for that by means of the gospel they have their people more obedient unto them, than ever they had before. Let them go, I pray you, into those places, where at this present, through God's goodness and mercy, the gospel is taught. Where is there more majesty? where is there less arrogancy and tyranny? where is the prince more honoured? where is the people less unruly? where hath there at any time either the commonwealth or the church been in more quiet? Per-

haps he will say, from the first beginning of this doctrine the common sort every where began to rage, and to rise throughout Germany. Allow it were so : yet Martin Luther, the publisher and setter forward of this doctrine, did write marvellous vehemently and sharply against them, and reclaimed them home to peace and obedience.

M. HARDING.

Your impudency of lying hath no measure nor end. But we will say little here, having said enough already in reproof of your falsehood. We leave you to the wide world, who seeth and almost feeleth your lies.....

But I marvel not a little, that in this place specially, where ye speak of the good order that your gospel breedeth, ye be not ashamed to make mention of Martin Luther. Good God, how much could we, if we were so disposed, allege out of his seditious and heretical books, by him ^a written against the power of lawful magistrates ! At this time let one place suffice for all ¹⁴. Luther's words be these : *Inter Christianos nullus neque potest, neque debet esse magistratus, sed* &c. : " Among Christian men none can nor ought to be a magistrate, but each one is to other equally subject. After the apostle's saying, 'Thinking all others better than yourselves,' &c. Again, 'Be ye humble all one to another.' Whereto Christ accordeth when he saith, 'When thou art called to the marriage feast, go and sit down lowest of all.' Among Christian men none is superior save one, and only Christ. And what superiority or magistrate can be there, where all be equal, and have right, power, riches, and honour all alike ? Furthermore, none coveteth to be over other, but all will be under one another. Where such men be, though one would, yet can he not make a magistrate to bear rule over others, sith that nature suffereth not to have superiors, where no man will nor may be a superior. And where such kind of men is, there be they not Christian men, after the true sort of Christian men." This far Martin Luther.....

He persuaded them to peace, when there was scarcely any left that could bear a club. First he ^b stirred up his disciple Thomas Munzer in Thuringia, who was the rebels' preacher. After that he excused him of seditious preaching to the duke of Saxony, prince elector, trusting if Munzer were let alone the matter should well go forward. . . .

^a Untruth, malicious and slanderous. Read the answer.

^b Nothing else but mere untruth. For Luther called him the preacher of Satan.

¹⁴ [The Editor has not found this tract.]

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

To dissemble the rest of your untruths, and your immoderate and uncivil bitterness, M. Harding, proceeding from the unquiet and unsavoury humours of your heart; where ye say, "Doctor Luther admitteth no civil magistrate," and note the same so specially in your margin; I marvel much, that your paper blushed not in your behalf. Read his books throughout, and consider the quiet government both of the commonwealths and also of the churches of Germany; and ye shall find that no man ever, neither by word nor by example, more advanced the authority of the *civil magistrate*. To leave all other his notable sentences to this purpose, against the rebels of whom ye speak, being then in the field against their lords, he wrote thus: "*God commandeth all men universally to obey the magistrate with fear and reverence,*" &c. Again: "Ye take the sword, and withstand the *magistrate, whom God hath appointed*. Is not this rashly to *abuse the name of God?*"

Johan. Sleidan, lib. 5.

But he saith: "Among Christians neither may be, nor ought to be, any magistrate." O, M. Harding, nothing could have found fault herewith, but only intemperate and mere malice. For Luther speaketh not these words of the outward *civil government*, whereof only we speak now, but only of our inward band, and obedience towards God. And in this respect there is no *king*, nor *prince* indeed, nor may be any. In this sense St. Paul saith: "There is no *Jew*, there is no *Gentile*: there is no *lord*, there is no *servant*: there is no *man*, there is no *woman*: for all you are one in Christ Jesu." St. Paul denieth not but *Jew*, *Gentile*, *lord*, *servant*, *man*, and *woman*, remain still in their several states and kinds as they were before. But in Christ Jesu, he saith, there is no regard of any such difference. In *civil government a king is a king*, and so hath God commanded him to be known. But after that we be once come to the reverence and obedience of God's will, there God only is the *King*: and the *king*, be he never so mighty, is but a subject. So saith St. Ambrose to the emperor Valentinian: *Noli te extollere, imperator: sed si vis diutius impe-*

Gal. iii. 28.

Colos. iii. 11.

Ambros. lib. 5. epist. 33. [ii. 857.]

rare, esto Deo subditus. Scriptum est: Quæ Dei, Deo: quæ Cæsaris, Cæsari: “O my lord, advance not yourself: but, if ye will remain long in empire, be subject unto God. It is written, *Give to God that belongeth to God: give to Cæsar that belongeth to Cæsar.*”

So saith the emperor Valentinian the elder of himself: *Ego sum in sorte plebis:* “*I am*” (in this respect) “*as one of the people.*” To like purpose Julius Cæsar, being an heathen prince, said sometime of himself at Rome in the council house: *Equidem ad alia omnia quæ pro vobis gerenda sunt, et consul sum, et dictator: quod autem ad injuriam cuiquam faciendum attinet, sum privatus:* “Touching all other affairs, that ought to be taken in hand for your sake, I am both your *consul* and your *dictator*: but as touching any wrong to be done to any man, I am as a private man, without office.” So said the heathen renegade Julianus the emperor: *Principes, ubi ad limen delubri venerint, perinde sunt atque privati:* “When the princes and *magistrates* once come within the entry of the temple, they are none other but as private men.” And this is all that traitorous and horrible judgment that, as it pleaseth you to say, Luther had of the *civil magistrate*.

Where ye say, he stirred up his *disciple* Thomas Munzer in Thuringia, to be the preacher to the *rebels*, it is no strange matter to see your tongue to run riot. Luther himself, writing thereof unto the *rebels*, saith thus: *Satanas sub evangelii prætextu, multos hoc tempore seditiosos, et plane sanguinarios doctores excitavit:* “Satan, under the *pretence of the gospel*, hath stirred up in these days many seditious and bloody doctors:” meaning thereby Munzer, and other like his companions. So far was Luther from the encouraging of Munzer to that wicked purpose, that he said, *he was set awork by the devil.*

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 5. Divis. 2.

But whereas it is wont sometime to be objected by persons wanting skill touching the Helvetians'

[Vol. iv. p. 40.]

Sozom. lib. 6. cap. 7. [il. 227.]

Dion. lib. 43. πρὸς δὲ τὸ κακῶς ποιῆσαι τινα, ἰδιώτης ἔν.

Sozom. lib. 5. cap. 15. [ul. cap. 16. tom. ii. p. 204.]

Johan. Sleidan. lib. 5.

change of state, and killing of Leopoldus the duke of Austria, and restoring by force their country to liberty, all that was done, as appeareth plainly by all stories, for two hundred and threescore years past, or above, in the time of pope Boniface the Eighth, when the authority of the bishop of Rome was in greatest jollity, about two hundred years before Huldreichus Zuinglius either began to teach the gospel, or yet was born. And ever sithence that time they have had all things still and quiet, not only from foreign enemies, but also from all civil dissension. And if it were a sin in the Helvetians to deliver their own country from foreign government, specially when they were so proudly and tyrannously oppressed, yet to burden us with other men's faults, or them with the faults of their forefathers, it is against all right and reason.

M. HARDING.

.....Now your spirit is not content with that ye have railed already against the pope and holy church, but it moveth you again to rave and cry out. But whether with more malice or reason let us indifferently consider.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 6. Divis. 1.*

But, O immortal God! and will the bishop of Rome accuse us of treason? will he teach the people to obey and follow their magistrates? or hath he any regard at all of the majesty of a prince? Why doth he then, as none of the old bishops of Rome ever did, suffer himself to be called of his flatterers, *lord of lords*, as though he would have all kings and princes, who and whatsoever they be, to be his underlings? why doth he vaunt himself to be *king of kings*, and to have *kingly royalty* over his sub-

Aug. Steuchus.

[Vol. iv. p. 41.]

jects¹⁵? Why compelleth he all emperors and princes to swear to him fealty and true obedience? Why doth he boast, that the *emperor's majesty is a thousand-fold inferior to him*: and that for this reason specially, because God hath made two lights in heaven; and because heaven and earth were created, not in two beginnings, but in one? Why hath he and his fellows (like *anabaptists* and *libertines*, to the end they might run on more licentiously and carelessly) shaken off the yoke, and exempted themselves from being under a civil power? Why hath he his *legates* (as much to say as most subtle spies) lying in wait in all kings' courts, councils, and privy chambers? Why doth he, when he list, set the Christian princes one against another, and at his own pleasure trouble the whole world with debate and discord? Why doth he excommunicate, and command to be taken as a *heathen* and a *pagan*, any Christian prince that renounceth his authority? And why promiseth he his *indulgences* and his *pardons* largely to any, that will (what way soever it be) kill any of his enemies? Doth he maintain empires and kingdoms? or doth he once desire, that common quiet should be provided for? You must pardon us, good reader, though we seem to utter these things more bitterly and bitingly, than it becometh divines to do. For both the shamefulness of the matter, and also the desire of rule in the bishop of Rome, is so exceeding and outrageous, that it could not well be uttered with other words, or more mildly. For he is not ashamed

Antonius de Rosellis.
[Monarch.
part. i. c. 12.
18. pp. 259. et
263.]
De Major. et
Obed. Solitæ.
De Major. et
Obed. Unam
sanctam.

¹⁵ [If any one doubts the wicked extravagance to which the papal pretensions were carried by his flatterers, he will do well to read the *Monarchia* of Ant. de

Rosellis J. C. Aretini, ap. Goldast. *Monarch.* tom. i. 253. There is an edition in the Bodl. Venet. 1487.]

Clemens 5.
in Conc. Vi-
ennen.

to say in open assembly, *that all jurisdiction of all the kings and princes of the world dependeth of himself.* And to feed his ambition and greediness of rule, he hath pulled in pieces the *empire of Rome*, and vexed and rent whole Christendom asunder. Falsely and traitorously also did he release the Romans, the Italians, and himself too, of the oath, whereby they and he were straitly bound to be true to the *emperor of Græcia*, and stirred up the same

Leo Papa 3.

emperor's subjects to forsake him: and calling Carolus Magnus out of France into Italy, made him emperor: such a thing as never was seen before.

Zachar. Papa.

He put Chilpericus the French king, being no evil prince, beside his realm, only because he fancied him not, and wrongfully placed Pepin in his room. Again, after he had cast out king Philip, if he could have brought it to pass, he had determined and appointed the *kingdom of France*, to Albertus *the king of Romans*. He utterly destroyed the state of the

Clemen. 7.

most flourishing city and commonweal of Florence, his own native country, and brought it out of a free and peaceable state, to be governed at the pleasure of one man: he brought to pass by his procurement, that whole Savoy on the one side was miserably spoiled by the emperor Charles the Fifth, and on the other side by the French king, so that the poor unfortunate duke had scant one city left him to hide his head in.

Idem Clem.

M. HARDING.

It is a great eyesore to the ministers of Antichrist to see *the vicar of Christ above lords and kings of this world: to see princes and emperors promise and swear obedience unto him.* But they that are the faithful subjects of the church of God think it no absurdity, that the shepherd be set, not only above the lambs and ewes of the church, but also above the wethers

and rams themselves. It is a very great folly for them to find fault with the superiority of the bishop of Rome, who can never prove that he is not the vicar of Christ. If he were not his vicar, yet being a bishop, he is above any temporal prince ^a concerning his priestly office. But sith Christ said to Peter, "Upon this rock I will build my church, and hell-gates shall not prevail against it;" ^b *bark until your bellies break, ye that be the hell-hounds of Luther's and Zuinglius' litter, or rather of Satan's, your and their chief master*, shall not prevail against the apostolic see of Peter. It hath withstood all devils and heretics a thousand five hundred years; and think ye, that yourselves be stronger than Arius? It grieveth you, that the pope is higher than the emperor, not for any love ye bear to the emperor, nor for hatred that ye have to the pope's person, whom ye know not, but your quarrel is against Christ, whose person the pope beareth. Or tell us, I pray you, doth he call himself any prince's or emperor's vicegerent, and not rather the ^c vicar of Christ alone? Whom impugn ye then, but Christ in his vicar? Have ye not readen, *Qui vos spernit, me spernit*: "He that despiseth you despiseth me?" Ye thought the pope had no better text for his primacy and supreme authority, than two lights which God made in heaven. But if malice had not blinded you, in the very same chapter of Innocentius the Third (from whence like a spider ye sucked that ye thought was worst) ye might have seen another reason going before, where he said, *Pontifex in spiritualibus antecellit, quæ tanto sunt temporalibus digniora, quanto anima præfertur corpori*. "The bishop," said Innocentius, "in spiritual matters passeth" (the emperor): "which spiritual things are so much above the temporal, by how much the soul is preferred before the body." How like ye that reason?..... Within a little after Innocentius bringeth forth another proof: where it was said to Jeremy the prophet, who came ^d of the priests' race, and was a priest himself, ^e "Behold, I have set thee over nations and kingdoms, to the intent thou mayest pull up, and scatter, and build, and plant".....

Then after that Innocentius had ^f by natural reason and holy scripture proved the highest bishop's superiority above princes, he cometh in the third place not now to prove, but to make his former saying, already proved, more plain, by alluding to that is written in the beginning of Genesis: where Moses declareth, how God made two lights in the firmament of the heaven, a greater and a lesser..... But this cannot sound in the ears of our new preachers. They would not have the guide of heavenly things above the guide of earthly cares. They love the earth, the flesh, the world too well, to be of that mind, and therefore do ask, why the popes of Rome, like anabaptists and libertines, have shaken off the yoke, and exempted themselves from all civil power. What yoke mean ye? The yoke of infidels and paynims?.....

Matt. xvi. 18.

Luke x. 16.

Distinction.
96. Duo sunt.

Jer. i. 10.

^a So is every simple priest.^b A little wit had been better than all this so great ado.^c So he calleth himself. But when did Christ ever call him so?^d As if Jeremy had been a pope.^e A very profound reason. Read the answer.^f By natural reason. O natural folly!

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

We are not the *ministers of Antichrist*, M. Harding, but the witnesses of the *truth of Christ*. He is *Antichrist*, as ² Thess. ii. 4. St. Paul sheweth you, "*that sitteth in the temple of God, and advanceth himself above all that is called God.*" And to speak more particularly of the matter, by St. Gregory's judgment, he is *Antichrist*, or the *forerunner of Antichrist*, that calleth himself *the universal bishop*: and vaunteth himself as the *king of pride*: and hath an *army of priests* prepared for him ¹⁵: and setteth himself, as Lucifer, *above all his brethren*. These be the words of St. Gregory: by such colours he blazed out the kingdom of Antichrist. Of him cardinal Franciscus Zabarella saith thus: *Papa facit quicquid libet, etiam illicita: et est* [al. sic] *plus quam Deus*: Gregor. lib. 4. epist. 80. [leg. epist. 30. ii. 881.] Gregor. lib. 4. epist. 82. de imp. fol. 744.] "*The pope doth what him listeth, yea though it be unlawful: and is more than a God* ¹⁶." This is *Antichrist*, M. Harding, by the judgment of the wise and godly: and the supporters of him, whosoever and wheresoever they be, are the *ministers of Antichrist*. It is great arrogancy to advance a *bishop* above a *king*: notwithstanding, in some good meaning it may be true. So a *judge*, in knowledge of the law: so a *doctor of physic*, in his profession: so a *pilot*, in knowledge of the sea, and guiding of a ship: so a *captain*, in martial affairs, is above any king: and it becometh a *king*, be he never so wise or mighty, in every of these several faculties to be guided by them. And thus is the *king* inferior, not only to a *bishop*, as you say, but also to every *inferior priest*.

So St. Chrysostom saith of Christ's apostles: *Omnem terrarum orbem pervaserunt, et omnibus principibus fuerunt magis proprie principes regibus potentiores*: "The apostles roved over the whole world, and were more princelike in deed than the princes themselves, and more puissant and mighty than the kings."

¹⁵ [For this reading "exercitum," see the note supra vol. ii. p. 142.]

¹⁶ [Cardinal de Zabarellis. "Quæ jura sunt notanda, quia male considerata sunt per multos assentatores, qui voluerunt placere

"pontificibus per multa retro tempora et usque ad hodierna suaserunt eis quod omnia possent," &c. Respecting the origin of the reading "sint," or "est," see ante vol. iv. p. 257, note ¹⁰.]

Chrysost. in Psal. xlii. [v. 181.]

Francisc. Zabarella. [in Synt. tract. de imp. fol. 243. col. 1. B.]

So said the emperor Valentinian unto the people of Milan: *Eum collocare in pontificali solio, cui nos quoque moderatores imperii nostra capita submittamus*: "Place ye such a man in the *bishop's chair*, unto whom we ourselves that govern the empire *may stoop our head*." Theodoret. lib. 4. cap. 5. [iii. 153.] αὐτῷ τὰς ἡμετέρας ὑποκλίνωμεν κεφαλὰς.

For the prince is bound to the obedience of *God's word*, no less than if he were a private subject. And, if he refuse to hear and to reverence the same, as the declaration of God's holy will, he is accursed. But what is this, M. Harding, to your purpose? Would you, therefore, that the *king* should swear his obedience and allegiance unto the *bishop*?

In this respect, by your own learning, any *simple priest* may well be above the *pope*. So saith your own doctor Panormitane: *Papa tenetur confiteri:.....et in eo actu sacerdos est major illo*: "The pope is bound to confess himself: and in that act of confession *the priest is above him*." And again: *Papa non potest cogere sacerdotem, ut revelet confessionem: quia in illo actu sacerdos est major quam papa*: "The pope cannot compel a priest to open that hath been said unto him in confession. *For in that act the priest is greater than the pope*." Yet, I trow, ye would not therefore the *pope* should swear obedience to a *priest*. Extra de Pœnitent. et remiss. Omnis utriusque: Abbas. [Panorm. iii. pt. 2. fol. 256.] col. 1.] [Ibid.]

This, therefore, M. Harding, it is, that grieveth us, to see the *poor stool of humility*, whereon St. Peter sat, blown up now into a *mount of pride*: and the *pope* to require homage and fealty of *kings* and *emperors*, as of his *subjects*. It grieveth us to see you, and others your fellows, in respect of the *pope*, so much, not only to abase, but also vilely to abuse the majesty of them, unto whom Christ and his apostles were always obedient. Remember, what one of yours hath written and published to the world in this behalf. Stanislaus Orichovius saith thus: *Tantum sacerdos præstat regi, quantum homo præstat bestię [leg. animanti ad pastorem objectę]:.....quantum Deus præstat sacerdoti, tantum sacerdos præstat regi:.....qui regem anteponit sacerdoti, is anteponit creaturam Creatori*: "A *priest* is so much above a *king*, as a man is above a beast: as much as God is better than the *priest*, so much is the *priest* better Stanislaus Orichovius in Chimera, fol. 97. [et fol. 99.]

than a *king*. He that setteth the *king* before a *priest*, setteth the creature before the Creator."

It grieveth us to see St. Gregory's words by St. Gregory's *successors* so proudly broken. For thus he wrote, well near a thousand years sithence, unto the emperor Mauritius, against John the bishop of Constantinople, claiming then the same *universal authority*, that is now usurped by the pope: *Ille coercendus est, qui sanctæ universali ecclesiæ injuriam facit: qui corde timet: qui gaudere de nomine singularitatis appetit: qui honori quoque imperii vestri se per privatum vocabulum superponit*: "Your majesty must repress him, that doth this wrong unto the holy universal church: that swelleth in heart: that desireth to enjoy a *name of singularity*: that also by a *private title*" (calling himself the *universal bishop*) "*placeth himself over and above the honour of your empire.*"

Gregor. lib. 4.
epist. 32. [ii.
749.]

Touching the knowledge of God's word, and cases of religion, certain it is, the *king* is inferior to a *bishop*. But if the *bishop* be negligent, and do not his office; or if he be wilful, and do it not rightly; or if he be ignorant, and cannot do it; then is the *bishop* under the *prince*, subject to his check, and by him may be punished. So writeth the emperor Constantinus unto the people of Nicomedia: *Si quis (episcoporum) inconsulte tumultuatus sit, ministri Dei, hoc est, mea executione, illius audacia coercebitur*: "If any bishop unadvisedly work trouble, his boldness shall be repressed by the order of God's *minister*, that is to say, by *my execution.*" Therefore St. Paul saith: "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers." Whereunto St. Chrysostom addeth these words: *Etiamsi apostolus sis, etiamsi evangelista, etiamsi propheta, sive quisquis tandem fueris. Neque enim pietatem subvertit ista subjectio*: "Although thou be an *apostle*, although thou be an *evangelist*, although thou be a *prophet*, or what one soever thou be," (yet be thou subject to the higher powers.) "For godliness is not hindered by such subjection."

Theodor. lib.
1. cap. 19.
[iii. 51.]

Rom. xiii. 1.

Chrysost. ad
Rom. homil.
23. [ix. 686.]

"Your quarrel," ye say, "is against Christ: for his person the pope beareth. Have ye not readen, 'He that

despiseth you despiseth me?" Tell us, I pray you," say you, "doth the pope call himself any prince's or emperor's vicegerent, and not rather the vicar of Christ alone?"

It forceth not greatly, by what title the *pope* list to claim. He cannot lightly want authority, while he may pen his own commission. I trow, we may say of him, as Cicero said sometime of one in Rome: *Asinius senator voluntarius: lectus ipse a se*: "Asinius is a very willing senator, himself appointed and chosen by himself." Verily Antichrist too shall sit in the *temple of God*, even in the place ^{2 Thess. ii. 4.} of Christ, and shall bear himself as Christ's vicar.

Howbeit, let the *pope* do the duty of a *bishop*: let him exhort; let him preach; let him dispense God's mysteries; let him fulfil his office; let him do the part of an *evangelist*: and we will love him, and reverence him, although not as Christ's *vicar-general*, yet at least as a *bishop*. Otherwise we must say unto him, as St. Gregory said sometime to Cyriacus, the bishop of Constantinople: *Omnes magnos esse et honorabiles cupio, quorum tamen honor honori omnipotentis Dei non detrahat. Nam quisquis se contra Deum honorari appetit, mihi honorabilis non est*: "I wish, that all men should be great and honourable, so that their honour be not prejudicial to the honour of Almighty God. For whosoever shall desire himself to be honoured against God, shall not be honourable unto me." One high and worthy reason we alleged out of your *pope* Innocentius the Third: *The sun is higher and greater than the moon: ergo, the pope is higher and greater than the emperor*. This *pope* Innocentius is he that said, *Either he would lose his mitre, or else he would pull the emperor Philip's imperial crown from his head*. Gregor. lib. 6. epist. 28. [ii. 879.]
De Major. et Obed. Solitae. [lib. 1. tit. 33. cap. 6.]
Carion. in Innocen. 3. [p. 390.]

"Malice," ye say, "blinded us: otherwise we might have seen other his more substantial and better reasons." So were it needful, M. Harding: for certainly this reason is very simple. But the best of his reasons ye can find is this:

The soul is above the body.

Ergo, *The pope is above the emperor.*

"And how like you this reason?" say you. Verily, as

a reason without sense or reason: such as be many of your making. By the like reason you may say:

The cook is always about the fire:

The fire is the highest of all elements:

Ergo, Of all sciences the cook's occupation is the highest.

By the same reason ye may prove, that the highest emperor is subject, not only to the *pope*, but also to every simple priest. Yea further, of the same reason there must needs follow a great inconvenience: that the *pope* himself, forasmuch as he ministereth sacraments, teacheth, exhorteth, and occupieth himself in spiritual affairs least of all others, is therefore the lowest and basest of all his clergy.

Now, M. Harding, I beseech you consider the weight and drift of your own reason.

The pope's charge is spiritual, say you.

Ergo, *The emperor is bound to swear obedience to the pope*. By what reason may this reason be proved? Verily by the same good reason ye may say:

Every priest's charge is spiritual.

Ergo, *The king is bound to swear obedience to every priest*. Yet by such proper reasons the *pope* hath advanced himself above all the states and princes of the world.

But your holy father Innocentius, lest he should seem to want scriptures for proof hereof, allegeth also the words of God spoken unto the prophet Jeremy: "Behold I have set thee over nations and kingdoms, to the intent that thou mayest pull up, and scatter, and build, and plant." "*Ergo*," he saith, "the emperor is subject unto the pope." "These proofs," ye say, "our defenders could not find." Further, ye say in your sober manner: "When will you forsake the school of lying?" Truly, if there be any such school, M. Harding, you may claim of good right to be the master. We are as far from lying, as you are from saying the truth. But what make these words of Jeremy for the bishop of Rome? Will ye say, that the prophet Jeremy was the *pope*? or, that the *king* then was sworn to be subject and loyal unto him? What *king* or *prince* did Jeremy subdue? What people or country did he ever overthrow?

One of your own doctors saith: "*Hieremias nullum regem*

Jer. i. 10.

Joh. de Parisiis, cap. 15.
[p. 128.]

deposuit. Sed intelligitur positus supra gentes et regna, quasi habens auctoritatem super ea in annuntiando et prædicando vera. Non de destructione regum mundi, sed de destructione vitiorum, et plantatione fidei et morum. Ut illud Pauli, Dei ædificatio estis: Dei agricultura estis: 1 Cor. iii. 9.

“Jeremy deposed no king. But we understand, that he was placed over nations and kingdoms, as having authority over the same, in opening and preaching of the truth. He speaketh not of the overthrowing of the kingdoms of the world, but of the overthrowing of vices, and of the planting of faith and manners. In this sense St. Paul saith to the Corinthians: ‘Ye are God’s building: ye are God’s tillage.’”

The very Gloss itself saith: *Ut evellas regnum Satanae: ut plantes bona: ut ædifices ecclesiam:* “I have placed thee to root up” (not the kingdoms of the world, nor the states of commonweals, but) “the kingdom of Satan: to plant good things: to build up the church.” His whole commission was limited with these words: *Posui verbum meum* Jer. i. 9. *in ore tuo:* “I have put my word in thy mouth,” saith the Lord.

Such authority had Elias over king Ahab: and therefore he said unto him: “It is not I, that trouble Israel, but thou, and thy father’s house.” Such authority had John the Baptist over king Herod: and therefore he said unto him: “It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother’s wife.”

If it be true, that ye would seem to say, that the *pope’s superiority standeth only in things spiritual*, wherefore then doth pope Nicolas say, *Christus beato Petro.....terreni simul, et cœlestis imperii jura commisit:* “Christ hath given to blessed Peter the right as well of the worldly as also of the heavenly empire?” Wherefore then did pope Adrian thus write unto the emperor Fredericus: *Romæ nostra sedes est: imperatoris est Aquis in Arduenna, quæ est sylva Galliæ. Imperator, quod habet, totum habet a nobis. Sicut Zacharias transtulit imperium a Græcis ad Teutonicos: ita nos possumus illud transferre ab Alemannis ad Græcos. Ecce in potestate nostra est, ut demus illud, cui volumus. Propterea constituti sumus a Deo super gentes et regna, ut destruamus, et evellamus, et ædificemus, et plantemus:* “My

1 Kings xviii. 18.

Dist. 22. Mediolanensis, [l. Omnes.]

Aventinus in Adrian. 4. [p. 390.] Anno 1154.

seat is in the city of Rome. The emperor's seat is at Acon¹⁵ in Ardenne, which is a forest in France: *Whatsoever the emperor hath, he hath it of us.* As pope Zacharias translated the empire from Græcia into Germany, so may we again translate the same from the Germans to the Greeks. Behold, it is in our power to bestow the empire upon whom we list. Therefore are we appointed by God over nations and kingdoms, to pull down, to root up, to build, and to plant again." This authority, I trow, reacheth somewhat further than only to *causes spiritual*. One of your own doctors saith: *Magis esset acceptum Deo, quod per solum pontificem mundus in omnibus regeretur*: "It were more acceptable unto God, that the world in all matters" (both spiritual and temporal) "were governed only by the pope."

Joh. de Parisiis, cap. 12.
[p. 123.]

"That Innocentius addeth of the sun and the moon," ye say, "is not a reason but a similitude." This thing may easily be granted. For indeed it is a *similitude* utterly void of either *wit* or *reason*. But who taught the pope so childishly to play with *similitudes*, thereby to advance himself, and to abase the empire of the world? Who told him, that the pope is the sun, and the emperor the moon? or, that the emperor is so far inferior to the pope, as the moon is inferior to the sun? Isidorus, that lived six hundred years before pope Innocentius, saith quite contrary: *Per solem intelligitur regnum, et per lunam intelligitur sacerdotium*: "By the sun we understand the kingdom: and by the moon we understand the priesthood."

In Gloss, in Gene. cap. 1.
Joh. de Parisiis, cap. 15.
[p. 128.]

Whereby he giveth us to consider, contrary to the judgment of your good father pope Innocentius, that, as the moon is inferior to the sun, so is the pope inferior to the emperor.

M. HARDING.

a Untruth, fond and peevish. For Sylvester was dead long before Constantine was christened.
b Untruth, too vain for a child. Why should M. Harding be so vain? There is not one true word in all this tale.

But when Constantine was baptized, he gave place to a St. Sylvester, then bishop of Rome, and to all other successors of St. Peter. O how that irketh your hearts, that so great an emperor, and the first that openly professed Christianity, should by the same Holy Ghost, who called him to the faith of Christ, be made to depart from that city, which ruled the world, and

¹⁵ [Aix-la-Chapelle: in German, Aachen.]

to yield his own palace, partly a church, to our Saviour Christ, partly a dwelling house for the bishops of Rome! Ask of Constantine why he submitted his neck to St. Sylvester. We have cause to think, that Constantius the heretic, son of Constantine, was not very glad of his father's doing. And yet God suffered him not to return and dwell at Rome, but to leave that city free to the rulers of the church.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

"Constantine," ye say, "gave over the city of Rome, and all the west part of the empire, to the pope, and to his successors for ever. And this thing," ye say, "irketh our hearts full sore." Yea verily, M. Harding, it irketh us much in your behalf, to see you, a man of wisdom and learning, to warrant such follies without blushing. This whole *donation of Constantine*, whereupon ye build the *pope's whole kingdom*, hath not show sufficient to mock a child. The effect and sense thereof is this, that Constantine the emperor, the third day after he was christened, in the honour of St. Peter willingly left all the west part of the empire, and departed to Byzantium, which is now called Constantinople, to dwell in the east: and that he gave the whole *imperial and civil dominion*, not only of the city of Rome, but also of Italy, France, Spain, Arragon, Portugal, England, Germany, Scotland, Ireland, Pole¹⁶, Denmark, Sweden, and Hungary to the pope. This doubtless, being true, had been a jolly liberal and princely gift. And one of your friends saith: *Volunt aliquid, quod, ratione hujus doni, summus pontifex imperator est: et quod potest instituere et destituere reges, sicut imperator*: "Some say, that by mean of this gift the pope is an emperor, and may set up and pull down kings, as an emperor."

a Joh. de Parisiis, cap. 22. [p. 140.]

But Pius Secundus, being himself afterward bishop of Rome, saith: *Dicta palea, Constantinus, falsa est*: "The said decree" (named *Constantinus*, containing Constantine the emperor's *donation or charter*) "is utterly false." So saith Antoninus the archbishop of Florence, Valla, Volaterrane, Hieronymus Cathalanus, Otho Frisingensis, and

¹⁶ [Poland.]

others mo. Of this fable we shall have occasion to speak hereafter. Here, M. Harding, the *pope* himself telleth you, that you maintain his vanity by a *false decree*.

“Constantius the heretic, son unto Constantinus,” as you say, “much misliked his father’s doing.” Nay, M. Harding, if Constantius were alive, he would rather find fault in your discretion, that report such follies of his father’s doings. Where ye say, “God suffered him not to return, and to dwell in Rome,” it passeth the depth of your divinity, to search up the causes and secrets of God’s sufferance. Although Constantius, being encumbered with dangerous wars and great affairs, were forced to stay in other countries, and could not have leisure to return to Rome, yet he still continued the *lord* of Rome, as also did a great number of other *emperors, that followed after him*. Therefore pope Bonifacius thus wrote unto the emperor Honorius: *Roma est urbs vestræ mansuetudinis*: “Rome is your *majesty’s city*.” Likewise pope Agatho writeth unto the emperor Constantinus: *Hæc est urbs servilis majestatis vestræ*: “This is your *majesty’s bond city* ¹⁷.” And Constantinus the emperor himself saith: *Dono archiepiscopo antiquæ nostræ Romæ*: “To Donus the archbishop of *our city of old Rome*.” But what need mo words? The case is so clear, that no man of learning can call it in question.

Briefly, touching this fond fable of Constantine’s *donation*, cardinal Cusanus saith thus: *Donationem diligenter expendens, reperi in [al. ex] ipsamet scriptura manifesta argumenta confictionis et falsitatis*: “Diligently weighing this *donation of Constantine*, I have found in the very penning thereof *manifest arguments of forging and falsehood*.” These, M. Harding, be the records and precedents of most certain and most ancient memory, that ye would have published unto the world. By such monuments your pope claimeth the right and possession of the empire. And your friends marvel, that ye can defend such falsehood and forgery, so well known and so manifest, for very shame.

Dist. 97.
Eccle.

In sexta Synod. Constan.
act. 4. [xi.
236.]

In eadem Synod. act. 1.
[xi. 195.]

Nicol. Cusan.
de Donatione
Constantini.
[de Conc. Cathol. lib. 3.
cap. 2. p. 781.]

¹⁷ [Agatho Constantino. Πρός- ἡμερωτάτου ὑμῶν κράτους πόλεως
ωπα τινά. . . ἀπὸ τῆς δουλικῆς τοῦ Ῥώμης. . . στεῖλαι φροντίζομεν.]

M. HARDING.

The being of the pope's legates and ambassadors in princes' courts, is a thing no less convenient than it is meet for him, that hath cure of many flocks of sheep, to set his servants as watchmen in every part, where such flocks do feed.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

In what stead these *legates* stand the church of God, it may appear by these few uttered thereof by Camotensis¹⁸: *Legati papæ ita debacchantur in provinciis, ac si ad flagellandum ecclesiam Satan egressus esset a facie Domini*: "The pope's legates do so rage in all countries, as if Satan were gone out before the face of God to scourge the church." And Machiavel saith: "There have been few wars or commotions inflamed these many late years but by the mean and whispering of these *legates*." What other doctrine they teach, or what other good they do, it were hard to say. And therefore the fathers in the *council* of Africa refused utterly to have any such *legates* sent amongst them: for thus they write unto the pope: *Ut aliqui, tanquam a tuæ sanctitatis latere, mittantur: nulla invenimus patrum synodo constitutum*: "That any *legates* should be sent unto us, as from your holiness' side, we find it not appointed by any *council* of our fathers." Again they say: "*Executores clericos vestros quibusque petentibus* [Mansi leg. potentibus] *nolite mittere: ne fumosum sæculi typhum in ecclesiam Christi.....videamur inducere*: "Send not your clerks (or cardinals) to put matters in execution at any man's request: lest we seem to bring the *smoky pride* of the world into the church of Christ¹⁹."

Citatur ab Agrippa de vanitat. Scientiar. [de Magistr. eccles.]

Nicol. Machiavel in historia.

Concil. Africa. cap. 105. [iv. 516.]

[Ibid.]

a Untruth. For they depend of the deceitfulness of man, and not of the power of God.

b Untruth. For Christ never gave the pope power to deal pardons.

M. HARDING.

Matt. xvi. 19.

^a His indulgences and pardons depend upon the power of binding and loosing, which Christ gave to Peter and his successors. Ye must demand of Christ, ^b why he gave that power, and not be angry with his vicar for using the same.....

¹⁸ [Camotensis. See vol. ii. p. 217. note ⁴⁶, and vol. iv. p. 119.]

¹⁹ [Concerning the reading "potentibus," see Preface to the

reader, supra vol. iv. p. 127; also vol. iv. p. 385; the Greek is τῶν αἰτούντων.]

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

O, M. Harding, what should you mean with all these vanities? Are ye so fully bent to grant no kind of error, neither in your *purgatories*, nor in your *pardons*, nor in your *stews*? God give you humility of heart; lest ye be an unfit vessel to receive God's *pardon*.

M. HARDING.

a Untruth,
joined with
open folly.
For this was
the only way
to strengthen
the Saracens.

Ye find fault with Leo the Third for making an emperor in the west: I dare say it grieveth you. ^a For if there had been none in the west, the Turk might have been our emperor ere this, and to his barbarous and wicked tyranny might have subdued this part of the world, specially Germany, as he hath subdued Greece, Asia, Egypt, Syria, and all the East church. Against which mischief the vicar of Christ, by his Master's merciful warning, with the princes of the west, made provision, and at the length planted the empire in this order we see it now in.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

This policy practised by the pope loosed the whole power of Christendom. For as the empire before, being united and joined in one, was strong and mighty, so being afterward divided into two, and the east part being sundered from the west, it became lame and weak, and not able to help itself. By mean whereof a gate was opened to receive the Turk into all these Christian dominions, which now he holdeth without resistance: who otherwise, the empire being one, and whole in itself, as it was before, could never have grown to such power. All this was wrought by the practice and policy of the *pope*. Notwithstanding, the *pope* himself by this bargain lost nothing. Thereof Marsilius Patavinus writeth thus: "Pipinus, son unto Charles the French king, after he had conquered Aristulphus [*al.* Aistulphus] the king of Lombardy, took Ravenna, and all the ²⁰ five cities of Romandiola, together with the emperor's lieutenant's territory, called Exarchatus, and gave all the same to the *pope*." Pope Steven finding himself well contented with these benefits, and seeing the weakness of the Greek emperor, procured that the empire should be translated from the Greeks unto

Marsilius Patavinus. [p. 151.]

²⁰ [There were *nine* cities in Romandiola. Vid. Baudrand.]

the French, having utterly forgotten the benefits that he had received of the emperor: *to the intent, that the Greeks, being utterly oppressed, and the French little caring for these things, he alone might rule in Italy at his pleasure.* The very true cause of the division of the empire.

Touching pope Leo the Third, whose providence and policy ye so much commend, the true report of the story is this: The said Leo, being by violence deprived of his bishopric in Rome, fled for aid to Charles the French king, and by him was restored. In consideration of which benefit, he proclaimed Charles *the emperor of the west*. Sithence which time the empire of Christendom hath been divided and weakened: the pope enriched: and the Saracens and Turks above all measure increased. Plat. in Leon. III.

M. HARDING.

If the pope Zacharias deposed Childerick (for so I find him more commonly named) the king of France, only upon his own pleasure or displeasure, as ye say, and placed Pipin for him, can ye tell that story, and not see what a strength of authority is in that see, which is able with a word to place and displace the mightiest king in Europe? With a word, I say, for I am sure ye can shew us of no army that he sent to execute that his will. Is that the power of a man, trow ye, to appoint kingdoms? Can the devil himself at his pleasure set up and depose kings? No surely. ^a And much less can any member of his do the same. Remember ye, what Christ said when the Jews objected, that he did cast out devils in the name of the prince of devils? ^b Beware ye sin not against the Holy Ghost, who confess that the pope hath pulled down and set up kings. Which thing undoubtedly he could not do profitably and peaceably, but by the great power of God. And yet did that line of Pipin and Charles the Great, which the pope did set up, ^c flourish above any other stock that ye can name since the inclination of the Roman empire. Which in that transposed state of so great a kingdom, maketh no obscure argument of heavenly approbation and divine providence.

Neither did the pope Zacharias depose Childerick, because he fancied him not, as ye slander, but only consented to loose his subjects from bond of oath made to him, at the general and most earnest request and suit of all the nobility and commonalty of the whole realm of France, finding him very unprofitable and unmeet for the kingdom, as one, who, being of no wit, and therefore commonly named *stupidus*, as much to say, a dolt, was altogether besides like a *Sardanapalus*, given wholly to belly cheer, and to filthy love of women. Therefore in your own words ye confess

^a Untruth. For St. Gregory saith, *Antichristus ipse summus hujus sæculi potestates obtinebit.*

^b A new sin against the Holy Ghost.

^c Untruth, easy to be seen. Read the answer.

d A divine
power in the
pope.

a divine power in the pope, as by whom God directeth the wills of faithful princes on the earth. The more such examples ye bring, the worse ye make your cause. I would hire you, to ease me of the labour of proving such a notable fact.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Pope Zacharias deposed Childericus, as you call him, or as some others call him, Chilpericus, the French king. Therefore ye say, "we must needs acknowledge a divine power in the pope: seeing him able by his word to place and displace the mightiest king in Europe. *For can the devil,*" say you, "*at his pleasure set up and depose kings?*"

John xii. xiv.
xvi.

Verily, M. Harding, Christ himself calleth the *devil* the "prince of this world:" and therefore we may imagine he may do somewhat in the world. And the *devil*, if ye will believe his word, when he had set Christ on high upon a mount, and shewed him all the kingdoms of the world, he said unto him, "All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." That is that power that St. John saith should be given to Antichrist:

Matt. iv. 9,

Rev. xvii. 13.

Reges terræ vires et potestatem suam tradent bestiæ, &c.: ut consentiant, dentque regnum suum bestiæ, donec compleantur verba Dei: "The kings of the earth shall give their strength and power unto the beast, &c. that they may agree together, and give their kingdom unto the beast, until the words of God be fulfilled." Again he saith:

In eodem
cap. 18.

Rev. xiii. 7.

Mulier ea, quam vidisti, est urbs illa magna, quæ habet regnum super reges terræ: "The woman that thou sawest is that great city, that hath a kingdom over the kings of the world." And again he saith: *Data est illi potestas in omnem tribum et gentem, et adorabunt eam (bestiam) omnes incolæ terræ, quorum nomina non sunt scripta in libro vitæ Agni:* "Power is given unto that beast over every tribe, and language, and nation: and all the dwellers of the earth shall worship the same beast," (which is Antichrist,) "whose names be not written in the Lamb's book of life."

August. in
Psalm. ix. [lv.
53.]

St. Augustine saith: *Quia Antichristus ad tantum culmen inanis gloriæ venturus creditur, tanta ei licebit facere, et in omnes homines, et in sanctos Dei, ut nonnulli infirmi*

arbitrentur, Deum res humanas negligere: “For that we believe, that Antichrist shall come unto such a height of vain glory, it shall be lawful for him to do such things, both towards all men,” (princes and others,) “and also towards the saints of God, that many weak men shall think God hath forsaken the care of the world.” Again he saith: *Ita traditur de Antichristo, quod omnes reges super-* August. in eundem Psal. [lv. 54.]
aturus sit, et solus regnum obtenturus: “Thus it is written of Antichrist, that he shall conquer all kings, and obtain the kingdom himself alone.”

So saith St. Gregory: *Antichristus veniens ipsas etiam summas hujus sæculi potestates obtinebit*: “Antichrist, when he shall come, shall conquer the highest estates and powers of this world.” Greg. in Job. cap. 41. lib. 33. cap. 22. [tom. i. 1104.]

And all this shall come to pass, as Chrysostom saith, by the dissolution of the empire, whereof we have spoken before. These be his words: *Donec imperii illius timor fuerit, nemo Antichristo statim subdetur. Quando vero istud imperium destructum fuerit, vacantem imperii principatum invadet, et tentabit ad se rapere et hominum et Dei imperium*: “As long as the empire shall be had in awe, no man shall straightway submit himself to Antichrist: but after that the empire shall be dissolved, Antichrist shall invade the state of the empire standing void: and shall labour to pull unto himself the empire both of man and God.” Chrysost. in 2 Thess. ii. hom. 4. [xi. 530.]

This, I trow, it is, that the pope proclaimeth himself the heir apparent of all kingdoms: this it is, that pope Nicholas saith: “*Christus beato Petro, æternæ vitæ clavigero, terreni simul, et cœlestis imperii jura commisit*”: “Christ hath committed unto blessed Peter, the key-bearer of everlasting life, the right both of the worldly and also of the heavenly empire.” This is it, that some are so bold to say: *Papa totius mundi obtinet* [leg. tenet] *principatum*: “The pope hath the princehood of all the whole world:” In Sexto. lib. 3. tit. 16. de statu regularium. [in glossa.]
and that some others have said²⁰: *Papa est rex regum, et dominus dominantium*: “The pope is king of kings, Antonius de Rosellis. [Monarch. pt. i. ap. Goldast. i. 263.]

²⁰ [Anton. de Rosellis Aretinus. See the note supra vol. v. p. 388.]

Aventinus in
Auriano IV.
[p. 390.]

and lord of lords:" and that pope Adrian saith of himself, as it is alleged before: *Imperator quod habet, totum habet a nobis. Ecce in potestate nostra est, ut demus imperium cui volumus*: "Whatsoever the emperor hath, he hath it of us. It is in our power to bestow the empire upon whom we list." This, M. Harding, is that *divine power*, that, as you say, is given to the *pope*. But as St. John, St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom, and St. Gregory say, the selfsame *divine power* is given also to *Antichrist*. And therefore it is well noted in your own Gloss: *Papa stupor mundi*: "*The pope is the wonderment of the world*:" that is to say, the *pope* maketh all the world fools.

Clem. in Pro-
cmio. In
Glossa. [col.
4. lit. y.]

Platina in Li-
berio.

But if it seem so great a matter for a *pope* to *depose* a *king*, I doubt not but ye may well remember, that *emperors* sometimes have *deposed popes*. The emperor Constantius (an Arian, I grant, but yet an emperor) *deposed pope Liberius*: and afterward restoring Liberius, *deposed pope Felix*. The emperor Otho the First *deposed pope John* the Thirteenth. The emperor Justinian *deposed two popes* in order: first, pope Sylverius, and afterward pope Vigilius. And all this did they without levying of army, without raising of power, without disquiet or trouble of the people. And a *doctor* of your own, seeming fully to determine the matter by a book case, saith thus: *Imperator, requisitus a cardinalibus, debet procedere contra papam*: "The *emperor*, being required by the cardinals, is bound to proceed" (to deprivation) "against the *pope*." Another saith thus: *Si quando imperialis legatus mitteretur a principe, ut Romanus pontifex proficisceretur Constantinopolim ad imperatorem, omni neglecta occasione, ibat, etiamsi pro certo sciret, se iturum in exilium*: "If at any time the emperor's ambassador had been sent from his prince to will the *pope* to come to Constantinople to the emperor, all occasions set apart he went straightway, notwithstanding he certainly knew he should be banished." Urspergensis saith: *Henricus rex Italiam ingressus, tres papas indigne constitutos synodaliter deposuit*: "Henry the emperor coming into Italy, *deposed* three *popes* unlawfully made, by order of synod."

2 tom. Con-
cill. in Vita
Sylverii et
Vigilii.

Joh. de Pari-
siis, cap. 14.

Appendix
Entropii, in
Sylverio.

Ursperg.
anno 1046.

Now, M. Harding, if you, with your rhetorical furniture, may cry out, "*O what a divine power had the pope, that thus could depose a king!*" why may not we likewise say, "O what a divine power had the emperor, that thus could depose so many popes!"

But that ye may the better see this wonderful *divinity and heavenly power*, wherewith ye would so fain enfeoff the pope, a witness of your own saith thus: *Quod dicitur, papam deposuisse regem Francorum, et loco ejus instituisse Pipinum, glossa ordinaria exponit, Deposuit, id est, deponentibus consensit. Non enim legitur, quod papa Zacharias regem Franciæ deposuerit: "Whereas it is said, that the pope deposed the French king, and placed Pipinus in his room, the ordinary Gloss expoundeth it thus: 'He deposed him, that is to say, he consented to them that did depose him.' For we read not that pope Zachary indeed ever deposed the French king."* Joh. de Parisiis, cap. 15.

The truth of the story is this: Forasmuch as Chilpericus the king seemed void of princely gravity, and had given himself over to pleasure and wantonness, and Pipinus his lord marshall, a man full of wisdom and activity, had the government and burden of all the realm, the nobles of France, having agreed among themselves to depose the one and to set up the other, sent unto pope Zachary, as unto a wise man, to have his answer to this question: *Whether were meet to be king, he that carried only the name, and did nothing: or he that bare the burden of the whole.* Paulus Æmilii, lib. 2. The pope was soon persuaded to give sentence with Pipinus the lord marshall, against the king. Whereupon the king was thrown [ed. 1570, shorne] into an abbey, and made a monk: Pipinus, advanced unto the state, gave the pope the *exarchate* or *princehood of Ravenna*, in part of recompense for his good will. Gaguinus. [p. 44.]

Whether the king, having nine years ruled his realm, were afterward deprived by right or by wrong, I will not reason. Fasciculus Temporum saith, "The kingdom was removed from the right heirs."

"The line of king Pipin endured and flourished a long

while: and that," ye say, " was no obscure argument of heavenly approbation and divine Providence." By such *approbation* and *providence* the Turk may claim. For he hath both longer continued, and much more flourished and increased his estate, than ever did the house of Pipin.

Plutarch. in
Catone Uti-
cen.

But Cato was wont to say: *Multum est caliginis in rebus divinis*: "There is great darkness in God's matters."

Yet lest any man of ignorance happen herein to be deceived, this was the very true *descent and flourishing fortune of king Pipin's race*.

Benvenutus
Imolensis in
Augustali.

The first thereof was Charles the Great: in his time, saith Benvenutus Imolensis: *Laceratum est imperium*: "The state of the empire was torn in sunder."

Paulus Emil-
lius, lib. 3.
[fol. lv.]

The second was Ludovicus Pius: against him his own son Lotharius arose, and caused him to be *shorn as a monk*, and to be thrust into an abbey, and his own *mother the empress to be made a nun*.

The third was Lotharius: he oppressed his own brethren by violence, and afterward was deposed and made a monk.

The fourth was Ludovicus II. He was unfortunate in all his doings: and was shamefully conquered by his brother.

The fifth was Ludovicus III.; whom, for his doughty deeds, they commonly call *Ludovicus nihili*: which is as much to say as *Lewis Nobody*.

Paulus Emil.
in Chronic.

The sixth was Carolus Secundus, named Calvus, as Benvenutus saith: *Vir lepore timidior*: "A man more fearful and more cowardly than a hare." He was shortly slain with poison.

The seventh was Carolus III., as Benvenutus saith: *Vir deficiens et animo, et corpore*: "A man wanting both strength of body and wisdom of mind:" that is to say, both a coward and a fool.

Benvenutus
Imolen. in
Augustali.
Nihil felici-
or patre.
In eo defecit
imperium in
gente Caro-
lorum.

The eighth was Arnulphus: he was eaten up with lice.

The ninth was Ludovicus IV. [*al.* III.]: by the report of Benvenutus, a man of no better fortune than his father. In him that house had an end. 'This is that *noble Pipin's race*,

M. Harding, that could not so stand and flourish, as you say, without special *heavenly approbation, and divine providence.*

M. HARDING.

Concerning that ye say of king Philip, surnamed Le Bel, if we may believe Paulus Æmilius, the best writer of the French chronicles, the cause was such between pope Bonifacius and that king, that if he did not only excommunicate him, but also offered gift of his kingdom to Albert the emperor, as Platina your author herein writeth, he may seem therein to have done ^a not altogether so evil as ye pretend. For, as both Æmilius and Platina do witness, the cause of their falling out was, that whereas the pope being first sued unto by Cassanus, a Christian prince, and a great conqueror in the East, to join with him for the recovery of the holy land, sent the bishop of Apamea to the French king for his necessary aid in that so common a quarrel of all Christendom, he being offended, either that the suit was not first made to him, either for that the said bishop had done his ambassade with show of more authority than the king thought it became him, or upon some private grudge, did not only utterly refuse to send any help toward the voyage, but also contemptuously, beside common order, and cruelly, committed the pope's legate to prison, and there kept him, until such time as, through the pope's interdict, the king was compelled to set him at liberty. Now of giving away his kingdom, this chief French historiographer maketh no mention. And if the pope so did, why may he not seem to have done it ^b rather to fear him, and to reclaim his mind from disobedience? Verily Platina writing it, declareth how, before the pope proceeded to that extremity, the French king did what in him lay ^c to withdraw the people of France from the obedience of the church and see apostolic.....

^a Not altogether so evil. A proper qualification.

^b A jolly way to fray a king.

^c By this divinity, if any kingdom refuse to be subject and thrall to the see of Rome, the pope may give the same away at his pleasure.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here, M. Harding, ye stammer in your tale, and know not well what to say: "If the pope gave away the kingdom of France from the prince, he did it," ye say, "to the intent to fear him." A pretty device to fray a king, to pull the crown imperial from his head.

First, this pope Bonifacius is he, of whom it was said: *Intravit, ut vulpes: regnavit, ut lupus: mortuus est, ut canis:* [Anselm. Ryd. in Catal. Ann. fol. 81.] "He entered into the popedom as a fox: he reigned as a wolf: he died" (in prison) "as a dog." In solemn procession he went attired with the *crown imperial* and *robe of majesty*, as an emperor, and commanded the *naked*

Paralip. Ursp.

sword to be borne before him. In the story of his life, joined with his own book, named *Sextus Bonifacii VIII.*, it is written thus: *Moritur hoc modo Bonifacius, qui imperatoribus, regibus, principibus, nationibus, populis, terrorem potius quam religionem injicere conabatur*: "Thus died pope Bonifacius; a man that sought more to strike terror into emperors, kings, princes, people, and nations, than true religion ²¹."

In vita Bonifacii VIII. in Sexto. [ed. Paris. 1561. ad calc. 6ti.]

Idem in Platin.

Sabell. Ennead. 9. lib. 7.

This Bonifacius, saith Sabellicus, sent to the French king for money, as he pretended, towards the recovery of Jerusalem. The bishop of Apamea, being his legate in that behalf, uttered certain great words in the presence of the king, and threatened him, unless he would grant it.

The king, not quietly bearing such presumptuous boldness, commanded the *apostolic legate* unto ward. This injury so inflamed the pope's choler, that immediately he sent the archbishop [archidiaconum] of Narbon to the king, to require him to set his legate at liberty; otherwise to tell him, that for his wickedness "the right of his kingdom was fallen to the church of Rome." Thus Sabellicus, in favour of the pope, thought it good somewhat to shadow the matter.

Martinus Polonus. [contin. Hist. aned. rev. tom. i. p. 1467.]

But others thereof have written thus: *Bonifacius VIII.mandat regi, se esse dominum in spiritualibus et temporalibus in universo mundo: utque rex recognoscat regnum Franciæ a se. Contrarium enim sentire et tenere, hæreticum esse*: "Pope Bonifacius VIII. sent unto the French king, and told him, that he was lord, both in spiritual, and also in temporal matters, throughout the world: and therefore that the king should hold his kingdom at his hand. For otherwise to think and hold, he said it was heresy." This is it, that in the name of the pope is noted in your

Dist. 81. Si quis [leg. Si qui sunt.] In Glossa.

Gloss: *Quicumque præceptis nostris non obedierit, peccatum idololatriæ et paganitatis incurrit*: "Whosoever obeyeth not our commandments, falleth into the sin of *idolatry* and *infidelity*." Hereof Urspergensis writeth thus: *Habes,*

Abbas Ursper.

²¹ [This "Vita Bonifacii VIII." has not been found in the editions of the Sextus subsequent to that of Paris 1561.]

Roma, quod sitisti: decanta canticum: quia per malitiam, non per religionem orbem vicisti: "O Rome, thou hast now, that thou hast so long thirsted after. Now sing merrily. For by thy malice, not by religion, thou hast conquered the world."

The king, being moved herewith, commanded that none of his clergy should come to the *pope's council*: he openly burnt the *pope's writs*: he commanded the *pope's legate* to depart out of his realm: he forbade that any money should be made thence to the pope: he gave out *proclamations*, that none of his subjects should go to Rome: and in the synod at Paris he charged the pope with *pride, ambition, murder, simony, and heresy*. Paul. Æmil. [fol. clxxii.] Sabellicus. Naucerus.

Thus much of the dealing of the crown of France unto a stranger: that is to say, of the *faith and reverence, that the pope beareth to kings and princes*. Here followed somewhat of the spoiling of the duke of Savoy, and of the altering of the state of Florence: which things I thought it best to pass over, as not worthy of any answer.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 5. Divis. 4.

[Vol. iv. p. 42.] We are accloyed with examples in this behalf, and it should be very tedious to reckon up all the notorious practices of the bishops of Rome. But of which side were they, I beseech you, that *poisoned Henry the emperor*, even in the receiving of the sacrament? which *poisoned Victor the pope*, even in the receiving of the chalice? which poisoned our *king John, king of England*, in a drinking cup? Whosoever at least they were, and of what sect soever, I am sure they were neither Lutherans nor Zuinglians.

M. HARDING.

.....The fiends of hell were not yet let loose, that begat Lutherans, Zuinglians, and Calvinists. And hereof we understand the youth of your church, which, having divided itself from the old and catholic church, is no other but the malignant church, and synagogue of Satan.

To answer your demands, whosoever they were, that poisoned these great personages, (if they were poisoned at all,) good men were they not, neither the doers, nor the counsellors. Henry of Luxemburg it was who was poisoned, by report: whom your Latin book, printed among the Huguenots, calleth Henry the Seventh: M. doctor Haddon, in his Answer to Osorius, accounteth him the fourth: in both your English translations (that I have seen) he is called only Henry. As he laid siege to the city of Florence, and had now brought the citizens to despair of their safety, when manly courage might not serve, they betook them to cowardly malice. First they poisoned (as it is said) the mind of a friar Dominican with gold, that afterward he should adventure to poison the emperor's body with venom. Paulus Lib. 8. *Æmilius* saith, that he died of a sickness, which he fell into at Bonconvento, as he journeyed from Pisa thither. Onuphrius, In Scholiis in Platinam. In Chronographia. writing of his death, saith, that he died at Bonconvento, a town in the territory of Siena, and maketh no mention of his poisoning. Cornelius Cornepolita, writing this story, seemeth to give little credit unto it. For he addeth, *Ut aiunt*, "As they say," as though it were a matter avouched by no certainty, but by hearsay. Nauclerus reporteth, that the order of those religious men is said to have a testimonial in writing, witnessing the foresaid friar to have been innocent, and that the whole was but a feigned tale.

Victor the Third pope is mentioned by Martinus Polonus to [Mart. Polon. Supput. p. 187.] have been poisoned by the *malicious procurement of the emperor Henry the Third*²², because he stood in defence of Gregory the Seventh, whom the emperor so much hated, and persecuted. Vincentius holdeth contrary opinion, that he died of a dysentery, as Platina reciteth.

Touching king John of England, they that write that he was poisoned in a drinking cup by monks, themselves make no better than a fable of it: and whosoever write it, refer themselves to hearsay, and to the popular fame. The *author of your Acts and Monuments reporteth*, that many opinions are among the chronicle writers of his death.....As ye proceed in your malicious railing against the pope, ye spit out your poison, demanding certain questions, short in words, but full stuffed with false and cankered slanders.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

The poisoning of that *noble emperor* Henry of Lucenburg²³ in the sacrament, whereby it appeareth, how far forth the states of the world ought to trust you, ye would

²² [Martinus Polonus says nothing of Henry III. being concerned in this murder; but the Supplement. Chron. states this fact.]

²³ [In Carion he is called *Lucelburg*.]

have us to pass lightly over as a fable²⁴. Of your Onuphrius and Cornelius, and other like *parasites*, we make no reckoning. The truth of the story is reported by many. Urspergensis saith: *Quidam religiosus porrexit imperatori intoxicatam eucharistiam*, &c.: "A certain religious man ministered unto the emperor *the sacrament poisoned*. The emperor having received it, and returning again unto his place, thought that a piece of cold ice was passed along through his body."

Baptista Egnatius saith, it was wrought by the policy of Robertus, king of Sicilia, moved thereto, as Aventinus saith, by pope Clement V.²⁵ The same ye shall find recorded in Carion²⁶, in Supplemento Chronicorum, in Ravisius Textor, and sundry others.

The like record there is found of poisoning of Victor III. in the chalice. For the more credit whereof it may please you to read Martinus Polonus, the pope's penitentiary, Volaterranus, Matthæus Palmerius, the Supply of Chronicles, Fasciculus Temporum, Textor, and others.

Touching the death of king John, whether he were poisoned by a monk, or no, I will not strive; referring myself therein to the credit of our *Chronicles*: the common report whereof, together with the general opinion of the people, is this, that he was destroyed with poison. But whatsoever were the cause of his death, Matthias Parisiensis saith thus: *Papa Innocentius sententialiter definivit*, &c.: "Pope Innocentius determined by sentence, that king John should be deposed from his estate. And he enjoined the execution thereof to the French king, for remission of his sins," promising him also faithfully, that if he so did, he and his successors should enjoy the kingdom of England for ever. So much is England bound to reverence and obey the pope.

²⁴ [See Replie, supra vol. i. p. 159, note 1.]

²⁵ [Aventinus: "a Bernardo Dominicano (qui auro male ab inimicis Cæsaris conciliatus fuerat) cœlesti victima toxica oblita. . . . extinguitur." The Editor has

sought in vain for this saying of Egnatius: which however is cited by Textor.]

²⁶ [Carion says the monk Bernhardinus was bribed by the Florentines.]

Paralip.
Ursper. anno
1313.

Baptist.
Egnat.
Aventinus.
[p. 460.]

Carion. [p. 424.]

Supplementum
Chronicorum. [lib.
12. fol. 277.
b.]

Textor in
Officina: Veneto
extincti. [lib. ii.
cap. 97. p.
252.]

Matth. Paris.
anno 1211.
[leg. 1212.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 7. Divis. 2.

What is he at this day, which alloweth the mightiest kings and monarchs of the world to kiss his blessed feet? [Vol. iv. p. 41.]

M. HARDING.

It is he (say we), that humbly for his own person refuseth such honour, that calleth and thinketh himself *servum servorum Dei*, “the servant of the servants of God.” But when he seeth the great powers and princes of the world humble themselves to Christ, Lord of all lords, and King of all kings, in the person of him, whose vicar on earth he is, and chief deputy in those things that be to God-ward; not unmindful what he is of himself, for the room’s sake that he beareth, and for his honour whose vicegerent he is, the rather also for ^a example of humility and obedience, so to be taken and learned of others of inferior degree, he suffereth that honour to be done, which is more than a mere man can require. Neither is this the pride of popes at these days only, as ye object, but the example of such humility in princes we can prove to be ancient.

The great king Charlemagne, who afterward was create emperor, could not be withholden by the pope Adrian the First, but at the first meeting he would kiss his feet. Many other emperors and kings have of old time done likewise. And lest the sovereignty of such honour exhibited unto him should in his own conceit lift him higher than for the degree of human condition, ^b to that purpose serveth the stool of natural easement at his creation, whereof your surmise is ^c very vile, to temper the highness of that vocation with the base consideration of human infirmities and necessities.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

What thing is there, either so vile or so horrible, but by such proper excuses may soon be smoothed? Chrysostom saith: *Hæc etsi minima esse videantur, tamen magnorum sunt causæ malorum. Nam et civitates, et ecclesiæ sæpenumero everterunt. Propterea nec a lachrymis abstinere possum, cum primos istos consessus et salutationes audiam, ac in mentem veniat, quot quantaque hinc mala in ecclesia Dei orta sint*: “These things, notwithstanding they seem small, yet are they the causes of great evils. For oftentimes have they overthrown both cities and churches. Therefore I cannot abstain from weeping, when I hear

a A proper school of humility.

b Fie for shame. Can not the pope learn humility but by a stool of easement?

c Untruth. For it is not surmised by us, but recorded by your own writers. Sabellicus saith: *Ut se- dentis gentilia ab ultimo diacono attrectentur.* [ix. cap. i.]

Platina in vita Adriani.

Chrysost. in Matt. hom. 73. [vil. 793.]

these *superiorities* and *salutations*, and consider how many and how great evils have grown thereof in the church of God." St. Hierom, much misliking the state of his time, saith thus: *Episcopi, velut in aliqua sublimi specula constituti, vix dignantur videre mortales, et alloqui conservos suos*: Hieron. in epist. ad Gal. cap. 4. [iv. p. 273.] "The bishops, as if they were placed in some high castle, scarcely vouchsafe to look upon poor mortal men, and to speak unto their fellow servants."

Touching the *bishop of Rome*, it is not for nought that St. Gregory saith: *Rex superbiæ in foribus est*: "The king of pride is even at hand." In the *pope's own book of the ceremonies of Rome* it is written thus: *Electus imperator cum suis omnibus servato ordine per gradus ascendit suggestum. Et ut primum videt pontificem, detecto capite, illum, genu terram contingens, veneratur: et iterum, cum appropinquat ad gradus sedis, genu flectit: demum, ubi ad pontificis pedes pervenit, illos in reverentiam Salvatoris devote osculatur*: "The emperor elect, going in array with all his train, passeth up the stairs into the scaffold. And as soon as he seeth the *pope*, he worshippeth him with bare head, touching the ground with his knee. Again, when he cometh to the foot of the *pope's* throne, he kneel-eth down. Last of all, when he cometh unto the *pope's* feet, he *kisseth them devoutly*, in the reverence of our Saviour." This is ordered as a special ceremony, and appointed unto the emperor as part of his duty. Gregor. lib. 4. epist. 38. [ii. 744.] Ceremoniar. lib. 1. sect. 5. cap. 3.

Likewise it is written of the *empress*, as concerning her duty: *Imperatrix coronata, mox osculatur pedem pontificis*: Ceremoniar. lib. 1. sect. 5. cap. 6. "The *empress*, being crowned, immediately *kisseth the pope's foot*."

Again of the *pope* himself it is written thus: *Papa nemini omnino mortalium reverentiam facit, assurgendo manifeste, aut caput inclinando, seu detegendo*: "The *pope* himself giveth no manner of reverence to any man alive, either openly by standing up, or by bowing down, or by uncovering his head." Ceremoniar. lib. 3. cap. 2. [fol. 286.]

"But the *pope*," say you, "humbly for his own person refuseth such honour, and hereby teacheth kings, and emperors, and all their subjects, to be humble." A strange

case, to teach *humility* in the *school of pride*. Such *humility* taught Julius Cæsar, Dioclesian, and Maximinus. Julius Cæsar raught out his foot for Pompeius Pænus to kiss, that folks might see his golden slipper set with stones.

Seneca.

Pomponius
Lætus in Di-
ocletiano.
[fol. 10.]

Pomponius Lætus saith: *Diocletianus edicto sanxit*, &c.: “Dioclesian commanded by proclamation, that all men should fall down, and kiss his feet: whereunto also he

Alexander ab
Alexandro.
[Genial. dier.
lib. ii. cap.
19. p. 418.]

added a certain reverence, adorning his shoes with gold and diamonds.” Maximinus also afterward did the like.

Such *humility* shall *Antichrist* teach, advancing himself above all that is worshipped, or called God.

Such *humility* the devil took upon him to teach, when he said to Christ: “I will give thee all these things, if thou wilt fall down and worship me.”

Matt. iv. 9.

Thus may the pope call himself *lord of lords, king of kings*, and set his foot on *emperors’* necks: and yet nevertheless, if he can frame a new title, and say he is *servus servorum Dei*, “the servant of God’s servants,” it is no *pride*: it is but *humility*.

Anton. in
Summa. par.
3. tit. 22. cap.
5. §. 4.

Antoninus saith: *Non minor honor debetur papæ, quam angelis. Unde papa recipit a fidelibus adorationes, prostrationes, et oscula pedum: quod non permisit angelus a Johanne evangelista sibi fieri*: “There is no less honour due unto the *pope*, than unto the *angels of God*. Therefore the *pope* suffereth the faithful to worship him, and to fall down before him, and to kiss his feet: which things the *angel of God* would not suffer St. John the evangelist to do unto him.”

This, M. Harding, is no *malicious railing*, as ye call it, nor *spite*, nor *poison*, nor *untruth stuffed with false and cankered slanders*. By the report of your own doctors, and by your own confession, it is the truth.

“The porphyry stool of easement serveth,” ye say, “to put the pope in mind of his humanity,” that is to say, that he may remember himself, in the midst of all his glory, to be a man. No, no, M. Harding, your own *authors* and stories can tell you, that stool serveth to put the *pope* in remembrance of his *virility*, that the world may know he is no woman.

But let your imagination stand for true. Yet may we think your popes are so forgetful, or so dull-headed, or so blockish, that they have need to be taught by so vile examples to know themselves? Certainly this is a *mystical* kind of *stool of easement*.

We cannot lightly lack *mysteries* at his hands, if so homely a place be so full of *mysteries*. King Alexander the Great understood himself to be a man mortal, as others were, and not a god, as he was borne in hand; for that he was sometimes of natural necessity forced to sleep. But *Christ's vicar, Peter's successor, the doctor of all doctors, the father of all fathers, the master and teacher* of all the world, were it not for a *stool of easement*, would quite forget his own *humanity*, and could never remember himself to be a man.

Plutarch, in
Alexandro.
[tom. i. p.
681.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 7. Divis. 3.

[Vol. iv. p.
42.]

What is he that commandeth the emperor to go by him at his horse bridle, and the French king to hold his stirrup? -

M. HARDING.

What he is, ^a we know not, ^a nor you neither, sir, defender. This we know, that in these words most impudently you belie the pope. For never was there pope, that commanded either French king or emperor to do the service you speak of. Part of that I have read pertaining hereunto I will here recite.

^a Untruths,
two together.
Read the answer.

The worthiest and greatest prince that ever was in earth, Constantine the Great, to witness openly the reverence which he bare in his heart to Christ our Saviour, and to St. Peter, whose successor the pope is, as likewise Christ's vicar in earth, disdained not to honour St. Sylvester, pope in his time, with doing ^b the office of a footman to him, and with leading his horse by the bridle. Wherein he seemeth, as first of all emperors he professed the faith of Christ openly, so first of all princes to have given to the posterity an example of humility. That no man doubt of it, this much I find recorded by an old father of the Greek church, Mattheus Hieromonachus, as uttered by Constantine himself: 'Ἡμεῖς δὲ στρατός ὀφείκιον ὑπελθόντες, καὶ τὰ χαλινὰ τοῦ ἵππου αὐτοῦ κατέχοντες, τῆς αὐλῆς τῶν ἱερῶν αὐτοῦ ἔξιμεν ἀνακτόρων, αἰδοῖ καὶ φόβῳ τοῦ κυρίου μου τοῦ ἁγίου συνεχόμενοι Πέτρου: which in English is thus much: "Submitting ourself to the office of a footman, and holding his horse by the bridle, we lead

^b All this is
a great un-
truth, and a
peevish fable.
Στρατός
ὀφείκιον.
This is Greek
even for a
pope.

[Matth. Hierom.
p. 26.]

him forth out of his sacred palace in the worship and reverence of St. Peter."

That sithence both emperors and French kings, of humility and devotion, and to witness their humble obedience to Christ in his vicar, have done the like service, yea though the pope shewed himself never so unwilling thereto; we find it reported in sundry good records. ^c But that he ever commanded any such service to be done unto him, ye can never shew it by any indifferent and credible witness. Paulus Æmilius, an Italian of Verona, in ^[Paul. Æmil. lib. 2] the second book of his Chronicles, which both diligently and eloquently he wrote of France, describeth how honourably Pipin, that worthy king of France, received Stephen the pope, that succeeded Zacharias, when he came into his realm. He both kissed his feet, and went by him at his horse bridle.....

^c Untruth, most manifest. For it is thus ordered in the pope's own pontifical, and in his own book of ceremonies.

The like honour of holding the stirrup would Charles the Fifth, the late great emperor, have done at Bononia to pope Clement the Seventh, had not the pope with much ado put him from it.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

This thing *sir defender* knoweth: notwithstanding you, M. Harding, dissemble it cunningly, and will not be known that ye know it. Neither doth *sir defender*, as you say, by these words *impudently belie the pope*. For trial hereof he referreth you to the pope's own *book of holy ceremonies*: wherein it is particularly appointed and laid out in order, to avoid confusion, what each estate ought and is bound to do.

Ceremoniar.
lib. cap. 8.
[sect. 3. fol.
38.]

Etiam si im-
perator, aut
quisvis maxi-
mus princeps
adesset.

Thus therefore it is appointed: *Cum papa per scalam ascendit, &c.*: "When the *pope* taketh his stairs to mount on horseback, the *greatest prince* that is present, *whether he be king or emperor*, holdeth his stirrup: and afterward leadeth his horse a little way forward by the *bridle*. But if there were *two kings* in presence, the more honourable of them should hold the *bridle* of the right side, and the other of the left. If there happen no king to be present, then let the worthiest persons lead his horse. But if the *pope* would not ride, but be borne on men's shoulders in a chair, then must four of the worthiest princes, *yea the emperor himself, or any other mighty monarch*, if he be present, bear the chair, *pope* and all, a little way forward upon their shoulders."

Sellam ipsam
cum pontifice
in humeris
aliquantulum
portare
debet.

Again: *Imperator, traditis pomo et sceptro, &c.*: "The

emperor, delivering over his golden apple and his sceptre to one of his men, cometh unto the *pope's* horse, and in honour of our Lord Jesus Christ, whose person in earth the *pope* beareth, he holdeth the stirrup until the *pope* be mounted: and afterward he taketh the *bridle*, and leadeth forth his horse. While the *emperor* doth these *profitable offices*, the *pope* ought modestly a little to refuse the same: and yet afterward, with certain good and gentle words, taking that honour as done to Christ, and not unto himself, he holdeth himself contented.”

Ceremoniar.
lib. 1. sect. 5.
cap. 4. [fol.
61.]

Dum imperator hæc utilitatis officia vult exhibere, &c.

Tandem cum aliquibus bonis verbis recipiendo permittit, &c.

Further it is appointed thus: *Caudam pluviæ portabit nobilior laicus, qui erit in curia, etiamsi esset imperator, aut rex*: “The most noble layman that shall be in the court shall bear up the train of the pope’s cope, yea though it be an emperor or a king.” Again: “Let the most noble layman, whether he be *king or emperor*, bring water to wash the pope’s hands. And while the pope washeth, let all the bishops and laymen kneel down.”

Ceremoniar.
lib. 1. cap. 8.

Ceremoniar.
lib. 1. sect. 3.
[fol. 43, 44.]

Again: *Pontifice sedente*, &c.: “While the pope is yet sitting at the table, the noblest man within the court, be he emperor, be he king, shall be brought to the pope’s credence, to give him water.”

Ceremoniar.
lib. 2. cap. 10.
Etiam si rex aut imperator sit.

Again: *Primum ferculum portabit nobilior princeps, sive imperator sit, sive rex*: “The first dish the noblest prince shall carry, whether he be emperor or king.” Again: *Rex in collatione portabit primum potum*: “When the pope is at breakfast, the king shall bear his first cup.” And again: *Pocula portentur*, &c.: “Let the pope’s cups be borne by the noblemen, or orators, being present: and let the clerk of the ceremonies begin with the worthiest estate: yea though he be king or emperor.”

Ceremoniar.
lib. 1. sect. 3.
[fol. 45.]

Ceremoniar.
lib. 1. sect. 13.
cap. 2.

Now I trust, M. Harding, of your courtesy ye will confess, that *sir defender* in these words hath not so impudently belied the pope. The pope’s own book of ordinances and ceremonies, that directeth all orders, saith thus:

The emperor shall hold the pope’s stirrup:

Let the emperor lead the pope’s horse:

The emperor must bear the pope’s chair on his shoulder:

The emperor shall bear up the pope’s train:

Let the *emperor* bring the *bason* and *ewer* to the *pope* :

The *emperor* shall give the *pope* *water* :

The *emperor* shall carry the *pope's first dish* :

The *emperor* shall carry the *pope's first cup*.

Thus may we go to the *pope* to school, to *learn humility*. For excuse hereof perhaps ye will say, These were the abuses of old times : but now all such disorders are well reformed. Therefore it may please you to remember, that the selfsame *ceremonies*, touching kings' and emperors' duties, have been lately renewed, and confirmed, and published abroad into the world, word by word, as they were before, without any manner alteration, even in the *pope's* own *Pontifical*, and that even now newly printed at Venice, in the year of our Lord a thousand five hundred threescore and one²⁵, whereby it may appear, ye are ashamed of nothing, be it never so shameful. What truth, therefore, M. Harding, is in your word ? or with what countenance could ye so boldly say, "That the *pope* ever commanded any such service to be done unto him by the *emperor*, ye can never shew it by any indifferent and credible witness ?" I doubt not but the *pope's* own *witness* is unto you of sufficient credit : and in his own case it must needs to himself seem indifferent. Verily, Gregorius Haimburgensis saith, that *pope* Adrian II. was highly displeased with the *emperor* Fredericus, for that he so unskilfully and so unmannerly held his left stirrup, whereas his duty had been to hold the right : and therefore utterly refused to give him his blessing, notwithstanding he desired it humbly upon his knee. Hereby it plainly appeareth, that in all offices and services the *pope* useth the *emperor* as his man. Therefore Aventinus reporteth these two verses, written sometime of the *emperor* Lotharius the Second :

Greg. Haimburg. in Appellation. Sigism. [p. 575.]

Aventinus in Fredericho 1.

REX VENIT AD FORES, JURANS PER URBIS HONORES :

POST HOMO FIT PAPA, SUMIT QUO DANTE CORONAM :

"The *king* or *emperor* cometh to the gates, and sweareth by the honour of the city :

²⁵ [The Editor has not succeeded hitherto in finding this edition ; but two editions in the British Museum, one of 1557, and the other of 1572, bear out bishop Jewel's statements.]

And afterward becometh the *pope's man*, at whose hands he receiveth the crown ²⁶."

That Pipinus so much abased himself to pope Stephen, it is no marvel. The proverb is common, *One hand claweth another*. The pope was advanced by Pipin; and Pipin was likewise advanced by the pope. But hereof we have spoken before.

Where ye say, "*The emperor Constantine the Great was footman to the pope*," I am much ashamed of your vanity, that, being a man of wisdom and learning, ye should thus seek to mock the world with childish fables.

Ye allege Matthæus Hieromonachus to prove a fable by a fable. If ye would dazzle your reader's eyes, for that ye allege his words in Greek, understand you, that his *peevish Greek* was taken out of your *peevish Latin*. And yet is the same Greek so fond, and so full of folly, that ye were ashamed truly to turn it into English. For thus it standeth: *Αἰδοῖ καὶ φόβῳ τοῦ κυρίου μου τοῦ ἁγίου συνεχόμενοι Πέτρον*: that is, "*In the worship and fear of my lord* ^[Matt. Hierom. p. 27.] *blessed Peter*." Ye durst not to make the emperor Constantine so rude to say plainly, that *Peter was his lord*: and therefore ye thought it better to corrupt and alter your *author's* words. Yet such vain fables and trifles must ye bring in, *to put us*, as ye say, *quite out of doubt*. But hereof we shall say more hereafter.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 7. *Divis.* 4.

Who hurled under his table Francis Dandalus, the duke of Venice, king of Creta and Cyprus, fast bound with chains, to feed of bones among his dogs?

M. HARDING.

Were not this defender past all shame, he would not make so many and so shameless lies. Malice hath so far blinded him, that he seemeth not to see what becometh a man. Though he fear not to be accounted a liar, yet he should be loath to be accounted an dishonest man, yea and specially a fool. Let truth and honesty go, for indeed there is little in these fellows. What foolishness is it, a man to bring all his doctrine, and all his say-

²⁶ [The work referred to has not been found.]

ings, touching things that he would so fain be believed, into so great and certain discredit, by such open and manifest lies! The truth hereof is this, as I find it witnessed in Sabellius, and in the chiefest chronicles the Venetians have, written by a nobleman of Venice, named Petrus Justinianus. The city of Venice being interdicted of the pope, Francis Dandalus was sent by the duke and lords of the council there, to sue for absolution. At that time was he neither king of Creta, nor of Cyprus, nor duke of Venice, as it pleaseth this lying defender to write of him, and that in the Defence of their English Church, written to all the world. Johannes Superantius then was duke, and this Francis Dandalus was ^a but a private man for that time, as others there were. This ambassador Francis Dandalus finding the pope at his first coming not well inclined to grant his petition as he wished, the ^b quality of the offence deserving the same, to move him to clemency and pity, advised with himself to play this pageant. He caused an iron chain to be tied about his neck. Therewith he came to the pope as he sat at dinner, put himself to creep on all four, and like a dog laid him down under the table so long, until the pope's displeasure being assuaged, he obtained pardon for his country. Whereof they say he had afterward the surname of Dog given him, as Justinianus writeth. Who desireth to see the whole story, he shall find it well written by the said Petrus Justinianus, *Historiae rerum Venetarum libro quarto*. Now let us see, sir defender, how many lies ye make in one sentence. That Francis Dandalus was by the pope hurled under his table, this is one lie. That he was then duke of Venice, king of Creta and Cyprus, there be two lies, beside the notable lie, you seem to be very ignorant of the state of Venice, in that you make the duke an ambassador, who being once created duke, goeth not out of the city. ^c Neither is ever any of their state king of Candy and Cyprus. For their state admitteth none to be a king among them. Howbeit, at the time of Francis Dandalus, Candy rebelled, and Cyprus was not yet come to be under the government of the Venetians, as you might have learned in the eloquent history that Petrus Bembo wrote of Venice his country. That he was fast bound with chains, there be three lies. For he was not fast bound, ^d only he had cast a chain about his own neck, which he might have taken off at his pleasure. That he was so thrown under the table to gnaw bones among the pope's dogs, ^d there be four lies. And that the pope had dogs feeding off bones under his table, ^d I doubt not but it is another lie. Whether these five lies be not enough for one little sentence of three lines, I report me to whosoever of your own fellows lieth for the best game. I think verily this defender, if he be not very shameless, wisheth he had a thicker beard to hide his silk cheeks from blushing. Such false causes must be defended by lying proctors. If they belied stories only, and taught not also false doctrine in the chief points of our faith, their lying were less hurtful.

Sabellius. Decad. 2. lib. 1. 1220. [p. 322.]
Historiae rerum Venetar. lib. 4.

^a Untruth. For he was then a senator of very great honour; and at the next election was chosen duke.

^b The offence stood only in helping their neighbour, being a banished man, into his country.

^c Yet the right and state of both these kingdoms is in his hand.

^d All these matters he full solemnly proved, and are worthy to be published by proclamation.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

So many lies, M. Harding, and, as you say, so far past shame, and such hot tragedies, and the cause no greater? What stir would ye have kept, if it had been matter worthy the hearing? What if the *author* of the Apology had been overseen in the report of one year, or two, or in some other like circumstance, the substance of the story nevertheless still reserved? If ye had remembered some of your own often oversights, ye could not for shame have been so terrible against others. For it appeareth well by all that ye have hitherto sent us over, your insight in matters is not so deep, but ye may often and foully be deceived²⁶.

These words of yours, M. Harding, are neither mannerly nor manly: notwithstanding, they seem well to content your pleasant humour. St. Hierom saith: *Non æque inimici audiunt, et amici. Qui inimicus est, etiam in scirpō nodum quærit*: “An enemy and a friend hear not both of one sort. An enemy will” (cavil, and quarrel, and) “seek a knot in a rush.” The substance of God’s religion standeth not in the reporting of a story. St. Hierom saith of such *captious quarrellers*: *Audiant a me, non periclitari ecclesiarum statum, si ego celeritate dictandi verba aliqua dimiserim*: “Let them understand, that albeit I, in haste of penning, have let escape a word or two, yet that shall not hazard the state of the church of God.”

Hieron. ad-
versus error.
Johan. Hierosolymit.
[iv. pt. 2. p. 307.]

Hieron. de
optimo genere
interpretandi. [iv.
pt. 2. 255.]

“But Francis Dandalus,” ye say, “was not at that time duke of Venice: he himself tied the chain about his own neck: he came of his own accord upon all four, as if he had been a dog, and lay down willingly under the pope’s table: he lay not there to gnaw bones: he found no dog there to lie with him.” Therefore ye say, “This defender is an dishonest man, past all shame, a liar, and a fool.” Such *choleric conclusions*, M. Harding, may well beseeem a *doctor of your divinity*.

Howbeit, the fairest colour ye can lay upon the matter

²⁶ [In the edit. of 1567, some Harding’s mistakes, in speaking strictures were added respecting of the *Decads* of Sabellicus.]

is this, that the *ambassador of that noble commonweal of Venice lay as a dog in a chain, underneath the pope's table, as you say, and that willingly, and with all his heart*, by such submission to appease the pope's high indignation, and to recover his favour towards his country. It seemeth, he was either a very arrogant man, or a marvellous angry pope, that would by none other submission be reconciled.

But Dandalus at that time was not duke of Venice. Neither was it so hard a matter to know that, M. Harding: nor was it so great an heresy to call him *duke*, for that shortly after he was made *duke*. St. Augustine saith: *Dicimus apostolum Paulum in Tharso Ciliciæ natum. At ille tunc jam non* [l. *Neque enim tunc*] *erat apostolus. Ita cum audimus, discipulos Christi invitatos ad nuptias, non jam discipulos, sed qui futuri erant discipuli, intelligere debemus*: "We say, that Paul the apostle was born at Tharsus in Cilicia. And yet Paul at that time, when he was born, was no apostle. Even so, when we hear, that Christ's disciples were bidden to the marriage feast at Cana in Galilee, we must understand, that they were not then his disciples, but became afterward his disciples."

So St. Hierom calleth Pamphilus a *martyr*: and yet at that time whereof he meant, Pamphilus indeed was no *martyr*. Therefore he saith: *Concedamus, ut Pamphili sit, sed nondum martyris. Ante enim scripsit, quam martyrium perpeteretur*: "Let us grant, it was Pamphilus' book: but that Pamphilus as yet was no martyr. For he wrote his book first, and was martyr afterward." Likewise again he saith: *Nos pro No, Alexandriam posuimus per anticipationem, quæ Græce πρόληψις appellatur*: "We, instead of the city *No*, have translated it, the city *Alexandria*, by a figure called *anticipation*. For that the city, which before was called *No*, was afterward called *Alexandria*."

So St. Augustine saith: It is written in the *book of Genesis*: *Hi sunt filii Israel, qui nati sunt ei in Mesopotamia: cum Benjamin longe postea natus sit, cum jam transissent Bethel, et appropinquarent Bethleem*: "These be the children of Israel, that were born to him in Mesopo-

Augustin. de consensu Evangelist. lib. 2. cap. 17. [iii. pt. 2. 48.]

John ii. 2.

Hieron. de errorib. Origenis. [iv. pt. 2. 347.]

Hieron. in Ezechiel. lib. 9. cap. 30. [iii. 912.]

Gen. xxxv. Augustin. in quest. super Genesim. quest. 117. [iii. 405.]

tamia: and yet Benjamin" (that there is reckoned for one of his children) "was born" (not in Mesopotamia, but) "long afterward, when they were now past Bethel, and drew towards Bethlehem, that is in Jewry." Yet hath there been no man hitherto so uncourteous, that ever would use your eloquence, M. Harding, and call either Moses, or St. Augustine, or St. Hierom, *fools* or *liars*.

If ye would but indifferently have weighed the matter, ye might well have thought, we called Dandalus *duke of Venice*, for that he was soon afterward chosen duke of Venice.

So we may say, doctor Harding in the time of king Edward freely and fully professed the gospel, and preached vehemently against the *pope*. Nevertheless, when he thus preached, he was not yet known by the name of a doctor. For he was doctored afterward in the time of queen Mary.

Let us grant, there was some error in the report of this story. Yet must every man be condemned for a *fool* and a *liar*, that may be taken in like error? If so, then will M. Harding trouble his godfathers, and cause them to give him a new name.

St. Chrysostom saith, there were *twelve magi* or *wise men*, that came to Christ²⁷: and yet ye hold commonly, they were but *three*. Clemens Alexandrinus saith, Christ preached *but one year*: yet others say, he preached *three years*: others say, he preached *four*. Some say, Christ was *three and thirty* years old, some say, he was *four and thirty, when he suffered*. Yet Tertullian saith, he was *only thirty* years old: Irenæus saith, he was *more than forty*²⁸. Christ saith: "My Father is able to give me *twelve legions of angels*." St. Hilary, in the report thereof, a great deal advanceth the number, and reckoneth *duodecim millia legionum, twelve thousand legions of angels*²⁹.

Matt. lii. 1.
Chrysost. in
Matt. homil.
2. in opere
imperfect. [vi.
app. 28.]
Clem. Strom.
1. [i. 407.]

Tertull. contra
Judæos.
[c. 8. p. 191.]
Irenæus, lib.
2. cap. 34. [i.
39.] et 40. [p.
148.]

Matt. xxvi.
53.
Hilar. in Psal.
liv. [p. 105.]

²⁷ [The author states, that there was always a college of twelve, with perpetual succession, whose duty it was from generation to generation to watch for the expected star.]

²⁸ [St. Irenæus states, that he

had derived this tradition from St. John, through that apostle's immediate hearers.]

²⁹ [Erasmus notices this error: the Bened. edd. excuse it, and allege that in one MS. of St. Matthew the larger number is found.]

Donatio Con- Your own *blessed donation of Constantine, which* (ye say)
stantini. *so much irketh us*, commandeth the *patriarch of Constantinople* to be subject and obedient to the *bishop of Rome*. And yet at that time, when by your imagination this fable was devised, there was *neither patriarch nor church in Constantinople*, nor any *city* as yet built and known by that name. Your fellow Dorman allegeth full solemnly the seventh book of Theodoretus: and yet Theodoretus himself never wrote but only five. And so he leapt two whole books beyond his author. And again he telleth us a proper tale of the terrible examples of *two kings*, Ozias and Oza: and yet both he and his fellows might soon have learned, that Oza was only a poor *Levite*, and no *king*.

M. Harding, You yourself, M. Harding, in this selfsame book, say,
fol. 308, b. *that the council of Nice was kept in the time of pope Sylvester*: and yet Athanasius, that then was present at the same council, saith, Sylvester at that time was not alive: but that the council was summoned by the emperor, and holden in the time of pope Julius³⁹. Again you say, "That at the very same time while the council was holden at Nice, pope Sylvester held likewise a council in Rome." And so by the judgment of Athanasius, ye say, "That pope Sylvester held a council after he was dead."

Athanas. in Apolog. 2.

M. Harding, holden in the time of pope Julius³⁹. Again you say, "That
fol. 309, a. at the very same time while the council was holden at Nice, pope Sylvester held likewise a council in Rome." And so by the judgment of Athanasius, ye say, "That pope Sylvester held a council after he was dead."

And must all these, and other your like tales, M. Harding, pass under the name of *lies* and *follies*?

"This gentleman," ye say, "was not so fast bound as we imagine, but fell down meekly and willingly of himself." No doubt, M. Harding, whoso knoweth an *Italian courage*, will soon believe, that Francis Dandalus, a gentleman of such nobility, and the ambassador of so noble a commonwealth, was soon, and easily, and willingly won, to come creeping with an iron chain on his neck, and to wallow under the pope's table, as a dog, to his own immortal shame, and to the everlasting dishonour of his

Willingly.

³⁹ [Bishop Jewel is here guilty of an inexcusable error: Sylvester was pope from A. D. 314 to 335. Julius was not elected before A. D.

337. What passage in Athanasius is intended, the Editor is at a loss to conceive.]

country. Verily he would never have yielded himself to such villainy, had it not been to avoid some other greater villainy. For I beseech you, whether is it more cruelty for you to run upon a poor man with sword drawn, and to strike him through, and so to kill him, or else to force him to lay cruel hands upon his own body, and to kill himself? In whether of these two acts is more cruelty?

St. Chrysostom saith: A poor man oftentimes is content to wound or fester his own flesh, to the end to move the rich man to some pity: *Alii capiti suo clavos acutos infigunt: alii per ipsum gelu nudo corpore mendicantes petunt: alii hisce etiam graviora ferentes, miserabile de se præbent spectaculum.....At dices, Nos illorum capita non configimus. Utinam vero tu configeres. Non enim tam gravis fuisset calamitas. Nam, qui alium interimit, longe levius peccat, quam is qui jubet aliquem seipsum interficere:* "Some there be, that stick nails in their own heads: some others go begging with naked bodies in the cold frost: some others suffer other things of greater cruelty, and shew themselves miserable to behold. But thou wilt say, We stick not these nails in their heads. Would God, thou stickedst them in. For then their misery were not so grievous. For he, that with his own hand killeth another, committeth a great deal less fault than he that forceth a man to kill himself."

So say we, it was far greater grief unto that noble gentleman so vilely to dishonour and abase himself, than if he had been driven thereto through the force and violence of his enemy. In this sort was the emperor Henry the Fourth *well content willingly* to wait upon pope Hildebrand at Canusium, and three days together to stand bareheaded and barefoot in the hard frost at his gate, and, as one saith, to be a gazing-stock both to men and angels, before he might have license to come near. So was the emperor Fredericus Ænobarbus *contented willingly* to lay his neck under the pope's foot, as we shall declare more hereafter. So was the poor *gentlewoman content willingly* to cast a halter about her own son's neck, and so to present him before pope Hildebrand, whom he had offended, by such

Chrysost. in
1 Cor. hom.
21. [x. 187,
188.]
Ad populum
Antioch.
hom. 37.

Ursperg. [in
A. D. 1076.]
Sabel. En-
nead. 9. lib. 3.

[Infra cap. 8.
div. 1.]
a Beno Cardi-
nal. [lib. 1.]

humble subjection to crave his pardon. In respect whereof, the pope pardoned him his life: but commanded his foot to be stricken off, of which wound the poor young gentleman soon after died.

Ye say, "It is a lie, that Francis Dandalus, so noble a gentleman, was driven under the pope's table to gnaw bones." I think it well, M. Harding, and therefore we will rather say, he lay there to gather up the crumbs that fell from his lord's table.

No dogs under the pope's table.

"But under the pope's table," ye say, "certainly there were no dogs. And this," ye say, "is another lie." Notwithstanding, this *negative* were very hard for you to prove. Howbeit hereat I will not greatly strive. And yet it had been a more seemly sight in my judgment to see a dog lying there than a man, and specially a *noble gentleman*, the ambassador of so noble a city.

Clem. lib. 2. de Sent. et re judica. cap. 2. [col. 128. E.]

To conclude, this was the same pope Clemens the Fifth that thus pronounced of himself, and proclaimed the same unto the whole world by a law: *Nos superioritatem habemus ad imperium: nos, vacante imperio, imperatori succedimus*: "We have the sovereignty over the *empire*: the *empire* being void, we are heirs apparent to the *emperor*." The Venetians had given aid to restore one Friscus, a banished man, unto the *dukedom of Ferrara*. Therefore pope Clemens interdicted them, and all that they had, and further signified his pleasure unto all the world, that whithersoever they or any of them came, it should be lawful for any man, not only to take their bodies, and to sell them for slaves, and to spoil their goods, but also to kill them, whether it were by right or by wrong. For so Sabellicus writeth: *Ut eos fas esset unicuique jure, et injuria interficere*. This was the cause of all this great ado. And this high indignation had never been slaked, had not so noble a personage abased himself, to be tied by the neck in a chain, and to creep under the pope's table upon all four like a dog. This disdainful fact Sabellicus the author reproveth vehemently, and with many words, as immoderate tyranny, and intolerable pride, and most shameful abusing of the state of princes. Yet M. Harding

Sabellicus Ennead. 9. lib. 7.

thinketh, it must be defended as very well done : and he must needs be damned, that will find fault with it.

Last of all, where it liketh you in the end to refresh your wits with this *defender's* thin cheeks and blushing : verily, M. Harding, he blusheth indeed, and is much ashamed in your behalfs to see your follies. God give you grace, that you may blush at your misusing of God's people, lest ye have that face, that the prophet saith is *past blushing*. I trust this *Defender* shall never blush to say, either with St. Paul, *Non pudet me evangelii Christi : est enim virtus Dei ad salutem* : "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ : for it is the power of God unto salvation : " or with St. Hierom : *Non me pudet nescire, quod nescio* : "I am not ashamed, in that thing that I know not, to grant mine ignorance."

Rom. i. 16.

Hieron. advers. Pelagian. lib. i. [tom. iv. p. 487.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 7. *Divis.* 5.

Who set the imperial crown upon the emperor Henry the Sixth's head, not with his hand, but with his foot : and with the same foot again cast the same crown off, saying withal : *I have power to make emperors, and to unmake them again at my pleasure?*

Cælestinus papa.

M. HARDING.

We deny that Celestinus, whom you note in your book's margin, or any other pope, did this. ^a It is a vain fable, devised rather of malice than wit. Ye should have done well to shew us with which foot the pope did set on the crown upon Henry's head, the right or the left, standing, sitting, leaning, or lying, barefooted and using the help of his great toe or shod, whether he had some jimjam made for him to take it up, hold it, and put it on handsomely, or conveyed it on by a vice, or how it was done.....

^a Untruth. For the stories be plain. Read the answer.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

What nimbleness or cunning the pope hath in his feet, more than other men, I have not heard. What other sleights he hath now, or hath had in times past, to work such feats, it behoveth his *Magister Cæremoniarum* to consider. The story is recorded by Ranulphus, Rogerus

[Ranulph. in Polychronic. fol. 292. col. 3.]

[Hoveden. p. 689.] Cestrensis, and Rogerus Hovedenus, that lived at the same time.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 7. Divis. 6.

Who put in arms Henry the son against the ^[Vol. iv. p. 43.] emperor *his father*, Henry the Fourth, and wrought so, that the father was taken prisoner of his own son, and being shorn, and shamefully handled, was thrust into a monastery, where with hunger and sorrow he pined away to death?

M. HARDING.

a Untruth, easily reprov-
ed by good
records.

a It was not the pope that armed Henry the Second against Henry the Fourth, who by the account of some is Henry the Third. Stories declare other causes of their falling out, and the more part of the writers impute it to the judgment of God, for punishment of his great wickedness. After that he was overcome with all his power by the Saxons in seventeen days he durst not to appear abroad. In the mean time his son took upon him forthwith the administration of the empire, went into Italy with an army, would not surrender the state which he liked well; his father being therewith offended, he took prisoner b without any motion of the pope, c with whom he was also at variance, and committed him to strait custody.....

b Manifest
untruth. See
the answer.

c Untruth.
For this was
not the cause.
But the pope
would have
given the
same him-
self.

d Untruth.
For then he
was at no va-
riance with
the pope.

e This au-
cient doctor
is yet alive,
and writeth
worthily for
his hair.

Concerning Gregory the seventh pope, who before was called Hildebrandus, whom that emperor with endless malice persecuted, because he would d not ratify his simoniacal making of bishops, and giving of ecclesiastical benefices, and defended the church against his wicked attempts: beside sundry writers of histories in that time, as Lambertus Schafnaburgensis, Leo Ho- <sup>[Leo Host. in
Cass. Chron.
lib. 3.]</sup> stiensis, and afterward Otho Frisingensis, who so much commend him for sundry excellent virtues, no man hath so largely and so <sup>[Oth. Frising.
lib. 6. c. 34.]</sup> diligently set forth his worthiness as e Onuphrius Panvinius, who hath written of him five books.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

We may easily believe you, M. Harding, that the *pope* armed not Henry the Second, as you say, against his father Henry the Fourth. It had been a marvellous monster in nature, that the *fourth* should go before the *second*: or that the *nephew* should be born before his *grandfather*. But that the *pope* raised up Henry the Fifth against Henry the Fourth, that is to say, the *son* against

the *father*, that ye might have easily found in your own records.

Gregorius Haimburgensis saith thus: *Paschalis papa* Greg. Haimburgensis. [in Appell. Sigism. p. 573.]
.....principes contra Henricum IV. concitavit: imo, ejus
proprium filium: quem etiam contra patrem fecit per multos
episcopos Rheni in regem coronari, et vocari Henricum
Quintum: "Pope Paschalis raised up the princes of Germany against Henry the Fourth: nay rather he raised up his *own son*, whom also he caused, by many bishops adjoining to the Rhine, to be crowned emperor against his own *father*, and to be called *Henry the Fifth*."

The case being clear, this one authority may stand instead of many. Hereof Henry the *father* piteously complaineth in his letters written to the French king. Carion saith: *Hunc Henricum filium sollicitarunt episcopi, ut adversus patrem insurgeret, eumque imperio pelleret:* Carion anno 1105. "The bishops enticed this young gentleman, Henry the son, that he should rise *against his father*, and put him from the empire." But these bishops, as Urspergensis saith, Ursperg. anno 1105. were *responsales Paschalis papæ*: "Pope Paschalis' agents or doers in those countries." And Henry the *son* himself, when he stood in the field, never pretended any other colour against his father, but only the obedience of the see of Rome.

And lest any man should doubt of the truth hereof, the *pope* not long before had likewise raised up Rodolphus, the *duke of Suevia*, against the same *emperor*, Henry the Fourth: and the better to encourage his ambitious head, and to train him to his purpose, had sent him a crown with Ursperg. eodem loco. [A. D. 1080.] p. 257. this posy:

PETRA DEDIT PETRO, PETRUS DIADEMA RODOLPHO ³⁰. Carion. [p. 360.]

Whereby he meant, that, as Christ had given the state and right of the *empire* unto the *pope*, so would the *pope* now bestow the same upon Rodolphus, if he would adventure to raise his power against the emperor his liege lord. Likewise he had written to the princes of Germany, as Carion saith: *Ut imperatorem alium designarent:* "That

³⁰ [This verse, here quoted from tus Gemblacensis: supra vol. iv. Carion, is found also in Sigeber- p. 478.]

they should proceed to the *election* of another *emperor*." Thus the *pope* thought it but a play, to place and displace the states of the world at his pleasure. Of this *emperor's* *virtues* I will say nothing. As he is dispraised by some, so by others he is much commended. Aventinus saith: *In pauperes, monachos, sacerdotes munificentissimum, &c.*: "His very enemies confess, that he was most *liberal* unto poor folks, monks, and priests: that he was *constant* in adversity: *faithful* to his prisoners: *gentle* to his foes: *devout* towards God: *wise and politic* in civil and martial affairs: of a *princely majesty* of countenance; wherein he excelled all others, and was *most worthy of the empire*."

Aventinus.
[p. 358.]

Ursperg. p.
239.

Urspergensis saith: "He was noble, doughty, and venturous: and was seen threescore and two sundry times in fought field, wherein he passed both Marcellus, and Julius Cæsar, and all other kings and emperors that had been before him."

Carlou. [p.
358.]

Platina in
Severino 1.

The greatest cause of falling out between him and the *pope* was this: Order was taken before, and had still been kept from the beginning, that the *election of the pope* should be ratified by the *emperor*, otherwise not to stand. And Platina saith: "*The pope elected without the emperor's letters patent was no pope.*" Another ancient order was this, that the *emperor* might bestow all the *bishoprics* and *abbeyes* of the empire, whensoever they should happen to be void. *These ancient orders pope Hildebrand* presumed to break. For neither would he suffer his own *election* to be ratified by the *emperor*, nor the emperor to bestow the *bishoprics* or *abbeyes* within his dominions. In these attempts the emperor withstood him, claiming unto himself the same right of inheritance, that all other emperors his predecessors had lawfully and peaceably enjoyed before him. Therefore the *pope* excommunicated him, interdicted his land, and called him *archpirate*, *archheretic*, and *apostata*. Therefore he deposed him, raised up the *duke of Suevia*, and all the world against him; and armed the *son* against the *father*; and wilfully disquieted the whole state of all Christendom. Aventinus saith: *Multi tum privatim, tum publice, &c.*: "Many there were, that both privately

Aventinus.
[p. 352.]

and openly cursed pope Hildebrand; and said, that with his hatred and ambition he troubled the world; and that under the colour of *Christ* he wrought the feats of *Anti-christ*."

The emperor took a long journey into Italy, to submit himself unto the pope: and being at Canusium, as it is said before, in the depth of winter, and in the hard frost, he waited patiently three days together with bare head and bare foot before the pope's gates to win his favour. In the end pope Hildebrand, being sick, and finding himself in case not to live, sent unto the emperor, and besought him pardon for all his injuries. After that, the popes that succeeded nevertheless continued this quarrel still. And thus by the pope's enticement the son raised a power and deposed his father: the bishops disrobed him of his weed of state, and pulled the crown imperial from his head. The ancient reverend prince, having now continued in his empire fifty whole years, bare all these things quietly, and said unto them: *Videat Deus, et judicet*: "Let God see, and judge your doings." At the last, being left naked and out of all, he turned himself to the bishop of Spira, and said unto him: *Now I beseech you, for God's sake, give me a prebend in your church. For I am able to read, and can do some good in the quire.* But he was kept still in close prison at Leodium, until he died. And being dead, he was kept five whole years together above ground, at the pope's commandment, and might not be buried: such courtesy found that worthy emperor at the pope's hand, only for claiming of his right.

"Pope Hildebrand is commended by many for sundry virtues. But no man," say you, "hath more set forth his worthiness than Onuphrius," a man yet alive, and one of all men that would be right loath in any point to displease the pope. Perhaps he thought to win some credit by adventuring his wits in a desperate cause, as did he that bestowed so much eloquence in the praise of baldness: or he that praised the fever quartan: or Erasmus, that of late years wrote so much in the praise of folly.

The heretic Ebion sometime praised Judas above all the

Ursperg.
[A. D. 1076.]
p. 235.
Sabellicus
Ennead. 9.
lib. 3.

Carion. [p.
361.]

Helmoldus.
[p. 71.]

Matt. Pal-
mer.

Synesius,
[Calvit. En-
com.]

Plato.

Socrat. lib. 3.
cap. 19. [il.
199.]

apostles: and Libanius the sophist bestowed great praises upon Julianus the renegade. Certainly sundry *old writers*, of whom some knew pope Hildebrand, and lived with him, have not given him such worthy praises. Beno Cardinalis saith: "Hildebrand, being as yet but a *cardinal*, beat pope Alexander with his fist, and kept him prisoner: *poisoned six popes*, his predecessors: was a *conjuror*, and a raiser of devils: and threw the *sacrament* into the fire³⁰."

Beno Cardinal.
[Annal. Boi-
orum. lib. v.]

Aventinus.
[Annal. Boi-
orum. lib. v.]

Aventinus, making his entry to speak of pope Hildebrand, saith thus: *Scripturus sum reipublicæ Christianæ, occidentalisque ecclesiæ, Romanique imperii bella, cædes, homicidia, parricidia, simultates, odia, stupra, furta, peculatus, sacrilegia, dissidia, seditiones plusquam civiles, &c.*: "Now must I speak of *vars, slaughters, murders, killing of fathers, strifes, hatreds, fornications, robberies, spoilings of common treasure, spoilings of churches, debates, and seditions more than civil*, which have happened in the Christian commonweal, in the west church, and in the empire of Rome." These were the fruits of Hildebrand's popedom.

Ursperg.
anno 1060.
[p. 237.]

The bishops at the council of Brixia, touching *pope Hildebrand*, pronounce thus: *Nos eundem Hildebrandum procacissimum, &c.*: "The same most *filthy and shameless pope Hildebrand*, a maintainer of *church-robbings* and *house-burnings*, a defender of *murders* and *perjuries*, calling in question the catholic and the apostolic faith of the *body and blood of Christ*, an old disciple of Berengarius the heretic, a manifest *conjurer*, loaden with the *spirit of Satan*, and therefore out of the true faith, we judge worthy to be deposed." Whatsoever points of descant Onuphrius your schoolfellow hath lately learned to play hereupon, this, M. Harding, is that holiness and worthiness, that sundry *old writers* have judged to be in *pope Hildebrand*.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 8. *Divis. 1.*

Who so ill favouredly and monstrously put the emperor Frederic's neck under his feet, and, as though that were not sufficient, added further this

[Vol. iv. p. 43.]

³⁰ [Concerning Beno's character see supra vol. iii. p. 35. note 26.]

text out of the Psalms, "Thou shalt go upon the adder and cockatrice, and shalt tread the lion and dragon under thy feet?" Such an example of scorning and contemning the majesty of a prince, as never before that time was heard tell of in any remembrance; except, I ween, either of Tamerlanes the king of Scythia, a wild and a barbarous creature, or else of Sapor king of the Persians. All these notwithstanding were *popes*, all *Peter's successors*, all *most holy fathers*: whose several words we must take to be as good as several gospels.

M. HARDING.

Ye ask who put the emperor Frederic's neck under his feet? &c. Verily who it was I know not: neither yourselves, I believe³¹.....

But what if ye bring good authority for it? So far as any man doth evil, be he pope, be he bishop, emperor, or king, or whatsoever he be, we defend him not. Popes themselves be men, and do not at all times behave themselves like angels. But what is that to your purpose? Our matter is *questio juris, non facti*; once more I must tell it you. And if that were a fault in the pope, we acknowledge it to be as Tertullian saith, *Vitium conversationis, non prädicationis*: "The fault of conversation, not of doctrine^b preached".....

a As though for the most part they lived like angels.

All these (though ye scoff never so much) were popes, all were Peter's successors, and, notwithstanding any thing that ye can say against them to the contrary, without making a lie, ^call were holy fathers. But their several words we be not bound to esteem for so good as several gospels. Nevertheless their public decrees we acknowledge and reverence, and think they ought to be obeyed.....

b What fault can ye find in the pope's preaching? He never preacheth.
c Untruth; shameless, as it shall appear.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

The whole story hereof is thus reported by Carion: *Usus est Fredericus dejectione, et summa humilitate*, &c.: "The emperor Frederic used all manner submission and humility. For he came to Venice, and at the gates

Carion. [in vita Alexand. III.]

³¹ [Harding adds, "In your lady's book, and in your Latin book first printed in London, I find the name of Innocentius III., and in that of your man's transla-

tion Innocentius VIII. is noted." The pope alluded to is Alexander III., but see the note supra vol. iv. p. 392.]

of the church falling down grovelling before the *pope*, he suffered himself to be trodden on by the *pope* with his feet. In the meanwhile the *pope* caused proclamation to be made by these words of the prophet David, spoken of Christ: ‘Thou shalt walk upon the venomous asp and the basilisk: thou shalt tread down the lion and dragon.’ And so at the last he absolved him. The emperor in the meanwhile said, he shewed that humility, not unto pope Alexander, but unto Peter. Thereunto the pope answered, *Et mihi, et Petro*: ‘Both to me, and to Peter too:’ placing himself before Peter.”

Non tibi, sed
Petro.
Et mihi, et
Petro.

Thus Carion declareth the whole story with some particular circumstances: but whether of favour or hatred, I will not judge. Neither may it well be thought the *pope* used the *emperor thus of any great favour*. But I think that the noble city of Venice, that caused this whole tragedy to be set forth in imagery in St. Mark’s church there, for the everlasting remembrance of the fact, was not so carried away either with love of the one side, or with hatred of the other, that they would so openly have recorded a known untruth.

Aurel. Victor.
[p. 342.]

Thus Saporess sometime, the proud king of Persia, when he had conquered Valerianus the Roman emperor, and taken him prisoner, used him afterward most villanously, as his footstock: and made him lie down grovelling upon the ground, that he might set his foot on his neck, whensoever it should please him to mount on horseback.

Pomponius
Laetus.

So Sesostrius, the great king of Egypt, yoked kings and princes together in chains, and forced them by violence to draw his waggon. So the emperor Henry the Third, upon the day of his coronation, caused four kings of Vindelicia, being then his prisoners, to carry pans and caldrons to his kitchen.

Budæ. de
Asse [p. 195.]

Matth. a Mi-
chovia, de
Sarmatia,
[lib. 1.] cap.
12. [Nov.
Orb. ed. 1537.
p. 502.]

But ye say: “So far as a man doth evil, be he pope, be he bishop, ye defend him not. The popes themselves,” ye say, “be men, and do not always behave themselves as angels.” Yet notwithstanding immediately after ye say further: “All these were popes, and Peter’s successors, and holy fathers.” This being true, it is no hard matter

for any *pope* to be *holy*. Pope John XII. [*leg. XIII.*] Platina. [in Johan. xlii.] was slain in *adultery*. Pope Benedictus IX. lived without either law or reason, and defiled *Peter's chair* with all kind of shame: *Sine lege et ratione vixit, et Petri sedem omnibus probis foedavit.* And in the end he took money enough, and sold the popedom. Platina saith, popes then were elected, not for their learning and holiness, but in respect of money and friendship. The bishops in the council of Constance pronounce thus of pope John XXIII: *A tempore juventutis suæ fuit homo malæ indolis, invercundus, impudicus, &c. Et adhuc dicitur, tenetur, creditur, et reputatur pro tali, et ut talis:* "From the time of his youth he hath evermore been a man of ill disposition, unshamefast, unchaste, dishonest, &c. And still hitherto he is named, holden, believed, taken, and reputed for such a one, and as such a one." Some of them have lived filthily with their own daughters, and some worse, and in more beastly disorder. Platina calleth them, *Monstra, et portenta*: "Monsters, and ugly, and horrible, and ill-shapen creatures." Yet say you, "All these were Peter's successors, and holy fathers." And so must they needs be counted, although they had been a great deal worse. Dame Joan, I trow, ye will have foreprised out of this number. For notwithstanding she were a holy mother, yet ye may not well call her the *holy father*.

Indeed thus ye have it providently noted upon your Decretals: *Est quædam spiritualitas secundum statum, quando est in statu sanctissimo et spiritualissimo: et in hoc statu est solus summus pontifex:* "There is a certain spiritual holiness according to the state most holy, and most spiritual: and in this state is only the *highest bishop*, that is, the *pope*." And a special statute of *præmunire* in the *pope's* behalf, is written thus: (*Papa de homicidio vel adulterio accusari non potest*³².) *Unde sacrilegii instar esset, disputare de facto suo. Nam [leg. vel] facta papæ excusantur, ut homicidia Samsonis, furta Hebræorum, adulteria*

Textor in Oficina. [lib. ii. c. 87. d. lib. v. c. 52.]

Platina [in Bened. ix.]

Platina In Sylvestro 3.

Constantien. Concilium. [xxvii. 684. d. e.]

Extrav. comm. De Major et Obedien. U. nam Sanctam. In Glossa [p. 191. E.]

Dist. 40. Non nos. In Glos. sa.

³² [The words in parenthesis are found in the margin of the Decretum.]

Jacob: "The pope may never be accused, neither of advoutery, nor of murder. Therefore it were as bad as church-robbing, to reason or move matter of any of his doings. For whatsoever he do, it is excused, as are the murders committed by Samson: the robberies in Egypt committed by the Jews: and the *advouteries* of Jacob."

Dist. 40. Non nos. And again: *In papa si desint bona acquisita per meritum, sufficiunt quæ a loci prædecessore præstantur*: "In the pope, if there want good deeds gotten by his own merits, yet the good deeds done by St. Peter, that was his predecessor in that place, are sufficient."

Dist. 40. Non facile. But St. Hierom saith far otherwise: *Non sanctorum filii sunt, qui tenent loca sanctorum, sed qui exercent opera eorum*: "They are not always the children of *holy men*, that sit in the places of *holy men*: but they that do the works of *holy men*."

Augustin. epist. 164. ad Emer. [ii. 210.] Therefore I may say to you, M. Harding, as St. Augustine saith to Emeritus the heretic: *Noli, frater: noli, obsecro: non te decet, etsi aliquem forte deceat: (si tamen quicquam deceat malos,) Emeritum certe non decet defendere Optatum*: "Do not, my brother; do not, I pray you: it becometh you not, although haply it may become some other man: if any thing may become the wicked, yet verily it becometh not Emeritus to defend Optatus" (in open wickedness).

Hieron. in epist. ad Philemon. [iv. 448.] St. Hierom saith: *Si quis hominem, qui sanctus non est, sanctum esse crediderit, et Dei eum junxerit societati, Christum violat, cujus corporis omnes membra sumus. Qui dicit, inquit, justum injustum, et injustum justum, abominabilis est uterque apud Deum. Et rursus [leg. similiter], qui dicit, sanctum non esse sanctum: et rursus, non sanctum esse sanctum, est abominabilis apud Deum*: "Whoso believeth that man to be *holy* that is not *holy*, and joineth the same man to the fellowship of God, doth villainy to Christ. For all we are members of his body. It is written, 'Both he that calleth a just man wicked, and he that calleth a wicked man just, are both abominable before God.' Likewise, whoso saith, *A holy man is not holy*, or, *An unholy man is holy*, is abominable before God."

Prov. xvii. 15.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 8. *Divis. 2 and 3.*[Vol. iv. p.
43.]

If we be counted traitors, which do honour our princes, which give them all obedience, as much as is due to them by God's word, and do pray for them: what kind of men then be these, which have not only done all the things beforesaid, but also allow the same for specially well done? Do they then either this way instruct the people, as we do, to reverence their magistrate? or can they with honesty appeach us as seditious persons, breakers of the common quiet, and despisers of princes' majesty?

Truly we neither put off the yoke of obedience from us: neither do we disorder realms: nor do we set up or pull down kings: nor do we translate governments: nor give we our kings poison to drink: nor yet hold forth to them our feet to kiss: nor opprobriously triumph over them: nor leap into their necks with our feet ³³.

This rather is our profession: this is our doctrine: that every soul, of what calling soever it be, be it *monk*, be it *preacher*, be it *prophet*, be it *apostle*, ought to be subject to kings and magistrates: yea, and that the *bishop of Rome* himself, unless he will seem greater than *evangelists*, than the *prophets*, or the *apostles*, ought both to acknowledge and to call the *emperor his lord and master*, as the old bishops of Rome, who lived in times of more grace, ever did. Our common teaching also is, that we ought *so to obey princes, as men sent of God*: and, *that whoso withstandeth them, withstandeth God's ordi-*

Chrysost. in
13 cap. ad
Romanos.
[ix. 686.]

Gregor. sæpe
in epist.

³³ [Here Harding interposes a whole page of "superfluous talk."]

nance. This is our doctrine: and this is well to be seen, both in our books and preachings, and also in the manners and modest behaviour of our people.

M. HARDING.

The doctrine of obedience appertaineth specially to subjects. The bishop of Rome sitting by due succession in the chair of Peter, ^a in spiritual causes can have no superior. In temporal matters it may be, that in one age he hath acknowledged the emperor as the lord of that province where he lived, ^b as before Constantine all the popes did live in subjection; and in another age he may be lord thereof himself. Likewise St. Gregory might call Mauritius his lord, either of courtesy, or of custom; and yet our holy father Pius the Fourth shall not be bound to do the like, in ^c consideration that the custom hath long since been discontinued. Neither did St. Gregory by that title of honour pre-judicate unto himself in any spiritual jurisdiction. For that name notwithstanding, he governed the ^d whole church, and complained that Maximus was made bishop of Salonæ, a city in Illyrico, without his authority, not regarding that Mauritius the emperor was thought to have willed it so to be done. And therefore he writeth to Constantia the empress, that forasmuch ^{Lib. 4. epist. 34. [ii. 752.]} as neither he nor his deputy was made privy to it, that the thing had been done, which never was done before by any of the princes that were the emperor's predecessors.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

What need you to speak so precisely and so nicely of your *causes spiritual*, M. Harding? Ye know that your *pope* hath claimed, and yet claimeth his sovereignty, not only in *spiritual causes*, but also in *temporal*, as it shall appear. He will say, ye are an ill proctor, and do him wrong, and go about to abridge his right, that will so lightly exclude that thing, that he so greedily will have included.

You say: "The pope can have no superior in spiritual causes." And yet by the judgment of sundry your doctors, even in *causes spiritual* the *council is superior to the pope*, and may summon him, and judge him, and give sentence against him, and depose him, as hereafter it shall be declared more at large. Thus it is noted of purpose upon your own Decrees: *Cum agitur de fide, tunc synodus*

a Untruth, manifest, as it shall appear.

b Untruth, enclosed: for they were subject likewise afterward.

c O grave consideration!

d Untruth, evident unto a child.

Concil. Const. [xxvii. 590.]

Concil. Basilien. [xxix. 21. d.]

Dist. 19. Anastasius. In Gloss.

major est quam papa: “When the case is moved in a matter of faith,” (that is to say, in a *cause spiritual*,) “then is the *council* greater than the *pope*.” And your own Panormitane saith, as it is alleged before: *Papa tenetur confiteri: et in illo actu sacerdos est major illo*: “The pope is bound to make his confession: and in so doing the *priest* is above the *pope*.” Again he saith: *Papa non potest cogere sacerdotem, ut revelet confessionem, quia in illo actu sacerdos est major quam papa*. Children know that *faith* and *confession* are *spiritual causes*, and not *temporal*. Ye see, therefore, M. Harding, by the judgment of your own doctors, that the *pope* may have a *superior*, even in *spiritual causes*.

Extr. de Penitent. et Remiss. Omnis utriusque Abb. [Panorm. tom. iii. pt. 2. fol. 256. col. 1.]

Now let us weigh the great force of your reason. Thus you say:

“The pope sitteth in Peter’s chair: *Ergo*, in spiritual causes he can have no superior.”

Who taught you thus to piece your arguments? What child, what sophister would so reason? Who ever gave such power and virtue to *Peter’s chair*?

“In temporal matters,” ye say, “it may be, that in one age the pope hath acknowledged the emperor as lord of that province where he lived.” Graciously considered! It was the *pope’s* courtesy and humility, no doubt: but not his duty. Howbeit, Aaron the high bishop of Israel was contented to submit himself to Moses, and of duty to call him lord.

Exod. xxxii. 22.

Tertullian saith thus: *Colimus imperatorem,.....ut hominem a Deo secundum,.....et solo Deo minorem.....Sic enim imperator omnibus major est, dum solo vero Deo minor est*: “We honour the emperor’s majesty, as a man next unto God. For so is the emperor greater than all men, while he is less than only the true God.” Origen saith: *Petrus et Johannes nihil habebant quod Cæsari redderent. Dixit enim Petrus, Aurum et argentum non habeo: qui hoc non habet, nec Cæsari habet quod reddat, nec unde sublimioribus potestatibus subjaceat. Qui vero habet pecuniam, aut possessiones, aut aliquid in (hoc) sæculo [al. negotio], audiat, Omnis anima potestatibus sublimioribus subjaceat*:

Tertull. ad Scapulam. [c. 2. p. 69.]

Orig. ad Rom. cap. 13. lib. 9. [iv. 655.]

Acts iii. 6. "Peter and John had nothing to give unto the emperor. For Peter said, 'Gold and silver I have none:' which whoso hath not, hath nothing to give to Cæsar, nor wherein he should be subject to the higher powers. But whosoever hath either money, or lands, or any thing in this world, let him hear what St. Paul saith, '*Let every soul submit itself to the higher powers.*'"

2 Quæst. 7. And for proof of the practice hereof, pope Leo thus sub-
Nos si. mitteth himself humbly unto Lewis the emperor: *Nos, si incompetenter aliquid egimus, et in subdilis justæ legis tramitem non conservavimus, vestro admissorum nostrorum* [al. *ac missorum vestrorum*] *cuncta volumus emendare judicio*: "If we have done any thing disorderly, and over our subjects have not kept the due trade and course of law, by your majesty's judgment we will redress all our faults."

Gregor. lib. 2. So likewise, long before pope Leo, pope Gregory wrote
epist. 100. ad
Maurit. Imp. suum et vestrum, respondebit Christus:.....sacerdotes meos
[il. 676, 677.] *manui tue commisi, &c. Ego quidem, (vestræ) jussioni sub-*
jectus, legem vestram [al. *eandem*] *per diversas terrarum partes transmitti feci*: "Behold, thus will Christ answer you by me, being both his and your most humble servant: I have committed my priests unto thy hand. As for my part, I, being subject unto your majesty's commandment, have caused your order to be proclaimed through divers parts of the world³⁴." Again he saith: *Christus dominari imperatorem, non solum militibus, sed etiam sacerdotibus concessit*:

Gregor. lib. 2. "Christ hath given power unto the emperor to bear rule,
epist. 103. [ad
Theod. Me- not only over soldiers, but also over priests." Again he
dic. ii. 678.] saith: *Et imperatori obedientiam præbui: et pro Deo, quod sensi, minime tacui*: "I have shewed my duty towards my lord the emperor: and touching God, I have not concealed what I thought³⁴." And this is it that St. Paul saith:

Greg. ad "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers." Upon
Mauritium which words St. Chrysostom saith: *Etiam si sis apostolus, etiam si evangelista, etiam si propheta, sive quisquis tandem*
Imperator. [il. 677.]
epist. 103. [leg. 100.]
epist. 100. [il. 677.]
Chrysost. ad Roman. hom. 23. [ix. 686.]

³⁴ [There is a misprint in one of these references: both quotations are from the same epistle, called by the Bened. Epist. lib. iii. 65.]

fuertis. Neque enim pietatem subvertit ista subjectio: "Though thou be an *apostle*, though thou be an *evangelist*, though thou be a *prophet*, or what one soever else thou be, yet be thou subject to the higher powers. For this subjection is no hindrance to godliness."

But afterward the *popes* began to look aloft, and both to say themselves, and also to cause others their parasites to say, *Romanus pontifex est supra reges in temporalibus*:

"The bishop of Rome is above kings, even in things *temporal*." Again: *Papa totius orbis obtinet [leg. tenet] potestatem*:

"The pope hath the power of all the world." Again: *Solus papa est verus dominus temporalium*: "Only the *pope* is the very true lord of *temporal things*." And again: *Omnis potestas sæcularis immediate data est papæ*:

"All manner *temporal power* is given immediately to the *pope*."

Johan. Major. 4. Sent. quest. 2. Dist. 20. [fol. 198. col. 1.] Sex. lib. 3. tit. 16. In Glossa.

Johan. de Parisiis, de potestate papæ, cap. 20.

Ye say: "Pope Gregory might call the emperor Mauritius his lord," (not of duty, but) "either of custom or of courtesy: yet" (say you further) "our holy father pope Pius the Fourth shall not now be bound to do the like." Here I beseech you, M. Harding, what strange kind of *spiritual power* hath pope Pius now gotten, that was not before in pope Gregory? What learning? what virtue? what worthiness? what holiness? what good reason can ye allege, wherefore Christ, and his *apostles*, and all other *holy fathers* and *martyrs*, should be subject to the prince, and only your late *popes* and *cardinals* should stand so free?

Ye say: "This custom hath long sithence been discontinued: and in one age the pope may acknowledge the emperor as the lord of the land where he dwelleth: and in another age he may be lord thereof himself." That is to say, In one age the *pope* may be subject to the *emperor*: and in another age the *emperor* may be subject to the *pope*. This is your whole and only reason. Thus we see your obedience towards your prince goeth not by *God's word*, but only by *ages*. Therefore we may say to you as St. Hilary sometime said to the Arian heretics: *Fides temporum est, non evangeliorum*: "Your faith passeth by ages, and not by

Hilar. ad Constant. Imperat. [p. 1227.]

Psalm. cxvii. 2. Gospels ³⁴.” And yet it is written: *Veritas Domini manet in æternum*: “The truth of our Lord endureth” (not for one age, or other, but) “for ever.” It were a high point of learning for an astronomer skilfully to prognosticate between the *emperor* and the *pope*, whether of them should be *dominus anni*. Howbeit, here may I well and justly answer you with these words of St. Bernard: *Omnis anima potestatibus sublimioribus subdita sit. Si omnis, et vestra. Quis vos excipit ab universitate? Si quis tentat excipere, conatur decipere. Noli* [leg. nolite] *illorum acquiescere consiliis, qui cum sint Christiani, Christi tamen vel sequi facta, vel obsequi dictis, probro* [al. opprobrio] *ducunt. Ipsi sunt qui vobis dicere solent, Servate vestræ sedis honorem, &c. Estis vos* [al. Et vos] *vestro prædecessore impotentiores? Si non crescit per vos, non decrescat per vos. Hæc illi. At Christus aliter jussit et gessit. Reddite, inquit, quæ sunt Cæsaris, Cæsari: et quæ sunt Dei, Deo*: “‘Let every soul be subject to the higher powers.’ If every soul, then is your soul subject as well as others. For” (notwithstanding your dignity, yet) “who hath excepted you from this generality? He that would except you from the obedience of the prince, seeketh to deceive you. Give no ear to their counsels. For notwithstanding they be Christians, yet they think it shame either to follow Christ’s deeds, or to obey Christ’s words. They use to say unto you, *O, sir, maintain the honour of your see, &c. Are not you so good as your predecessor? If your see be not advanced by you, yet let it not be abased by you.* Thus say they. But Christ hath both taught and wrought far otherwise. For he saith, ‘*Give to Cæsar, that belongeth to Cæsar: and give to God, that belongeth to God.*’”

Likewise he saith again unto pope Eugenius: *A te tamen mos iste, vel potius, mors ista non cæpit: utinam in te desinat.....vides omnem ecclesiasticum zelum fervere sola pro dignitate tuenda? Honori totum datur: sanctitati nihil, vel parum. Si causa requirente, paulo submissius agere, ac socialius te habere tentaveris, Absit, inquit: non decet: temporari non congruit: majestati non convenit: quam geras*

Bern. epist.
42. ad Archi-
episcop. Seno-
nens. [ii.
480.]

Bern. de
Considera-
tion. lib. 4.
[ii. 443.]

³⁴ [Supra, vol. i. p. 439.]

personam attendito: “But ye will say, this manner, or rather this *death*, began not of you: would God it might end in you. Do ye not see, that all your ecclesiastical zeal and care standeth only in maintenance of honour? Upon honour all together is bestowed: upon holiness either nothing, or very little. If upon occasion ye would somewhat submit yourself, and deal familiarly, *O do not so*, say they: *it is not meet: it is not agreeable to the time: it is not convenient for your majesty: consider well what state ye bear.*” Such good lessons, M. Harding, ye have, wherewith to nurture and to train the pope. And if he happen of himself to be a fool, by such schooling ye are able to make him mad.

“But Gregory,” ye say, “being pope, governed the whole church of God. For he complaineth, that Maximus was made bishop of Salonæ in Illyrico without his allowance.” This authority is answered in my former Reply. But how holdeth this argument, M. Harding? *Gregory complaineth, that Maximus was made bishop of Salonæ in Illyrico without his allowance: Ergo, Gregory ruled the whole church.*

Gregor. lib.
4. epist. 78.
[leg. 34. ii.
752.]
Articul. 4.
Divis. 25.
[supra vol. ii.
258.]

What school will allow you such conclusions? It is known, that in the *Nicene council* the charge of the whole church was committed to three *principal patriarchs*, whereof the *patriarch of Rome* was the first: the second of *Alexandria*: the third of *Antioch*. And each of these three was limited severally to his own peculiar portion. Nilus, a Greek writer, saith: *Cum aliæ regiones assignatæ sint Romano, aliæ Alexandrino, aliæ Constantinopolitano, non magis hi sub illo sunt, quam ille sub hisce*: “Forasmuch as certain countries are limited to the bishop of Rome, certain to the bishop of Alexandria, and certain to the bishop of Constantinople, *they are now no more under him, than he under them*”³⁵.

Nilus de Pri-
mat. Rom.
Pon. [lib. ii.
p. 67.]

As for the churches of Illyricum, they were specially appointed to the *bishop of Rome*, as it appeareth by the

³⁵ [Nilus. Εἰ δ' ἐκεῖνο μὲν ἀπεκλήρωθη τῷ Ῥώμῃ, ἐκεῖνο δὲ τῷ Ἀλεξανδρείας, τοῦτο δὲ τῇ Κωνσταντίνου, οὐ μᾶλλον γε ὁ Ῥώμῃς ὑπ' ἐκείνους, ἢ ἐκεῖνοι ὑπὸ τῆς Ῥώμῃς ὅσα γε εἰς τοῦτο τελέσουσιν.]

epistle of pope Damasus, written to the bishops of Illyricum: *Par est omnes qui sunt in orbe Romano magistros consentire*: “It is meet, that all the teachers that be within the *Roman province* agree together.” So saith Athanasius: *Roma est metropolis Romanæ ditionis*: “*Rome is the mother church*” (not of the whole world, but) “*of the province of Rome*.” Nicephorus saith: *Justinianus decrevit, ut Justiniana prima haberet locum sedis apostolicæ (Romæ); utque esset caput sibi ipsi cum plena potestate*: “Justinianus the emperor appointed, that the city called *Justiniana prima* should have the place of the apostolic see of Rome: and that with full power it should be head unto itself³⁶.” Neither durst your forged and counterfeit Anacletus to claim the jurisdiction of all the whole world, but only a portion of the same. For thus he saith: *Omnes episcopi qui hujus apostolicæ sedis ordinationi subjacent*: “All bishops” (not through the world, but) “that are subject to the ordination of this apostolic see of Rome.” So likewise St. Gregory, in his complaint unto the empress, touching this same Maximus, the bishop of Salonæ, speaketh not of all the bishops that were throughout the whole church of God, but only of such bishops as were limited unto his particular charge. For thus he maketh his complaint: *Si episcopi mei me despiciant, &c.*: “If mine own bishops” (lying within mine own peculiar jurisdiction) “shall despise me.”

Therefore your *divinity* wanted *logic*, M. Harding, when ye framed your argument in this sort: *Gregory complained of Maximus, &c.*: Ergo, *Gregory governed the whole church*.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 9. *Divis. 1 and 2.*

But where they say, we have gone away from the unity of the catholic church, this is not only a matter of malice, but besides, though it be most untrue,

³⁶ [This passage is not correctly quoted, whether taken from the original or from a translation of Nicephorus. Γέρας δ' ἐξαίσιον καὶ Ἀχριδῶ τῇ πατρίδι νέμων ὁ Ἰου-

στιμανὸς, εἰς ἀρχιεπισκοπὴν ταύτην ἐτίμα, καὶ αὐτοκέφαλον ἐκκλησίαν καθίστα, πρώτῃν Ἰουστινιανὴν ὀνομάσας.]

[Vol. iv. p. 44.]

Sozomen. lib. 6. cap. 23. [ii. 247.]

Athanas. ad solitariam vitam agentes. [i. 364.]

Nicephor. lib. 17. cap. 28. [ii. 779.]

Anacl. epist. 3. Dist. 93. Juxta Sanc-torum.

Gregor. lib. 4. epist. 34. [ii. 752.]

yet hath it some show and appearance of truth. For the common people, and ignorant multitude, give not credit only to things true, and of certainty, but even to such things also, if any chance, which may seem to have but a resemblance of truth. Therefore we see that subtle and crafty persons, when they had no truth on their side, have ever contended and hotly argued with things likely to be true, to the intent they which were not able to espy the very ground of the matter, might be carried away at least with some pretence and probability or likelihood of the truth. In times past, whereas the first Christians, our forefathers, in making their prayers to God, did turn themselves towards the east, as for the most part the manner was, there were that said, *they worshipped the sun, and reckoned the same as their god*. Again, where our forefathers said, that, as touching immortal and everlasting life, they lived by none other means, but by the *flesh and blood of that Lamb without spot*, that is to say, of our Saviour Jesus Christ; the envious creatures, and enemies of Christ's cross, whose only care was to bring Christian religion into slander by all manner of ways, made the people believe, that they were wicked persons; that they *sacrificed men's flesh, and drunk men's blood*. Also, where our forefathers said, that before God *there is neither man nor woman*, and that, for attaining to the true righteousness, there is no distinction at all of persons: and whereas they called one another indifferently by the name of *sisters and brothers*, there wanted not men, which forged false tales upon the same, saying, that the Christians made no difference among themselves, either of age or of

Tertull. in
Apologet. [c.
16. p. 16.]

Ibidem. [c. 8.
p. 9.]

Ibidem.

August. contra Faust. lib. 20. cap. 13. [viii. 342.]

kind : but like brute beasts, without regard, had to do one with another. And whereas to pray together, and to hear the gospel, they met often together in secret and bye places, because rebels sometime were wont to do the like, therefore rumours were everywhere spread abroad, that they made *privy confederacies*, and took counsel together, either to kill the magistrates, or to subvert the commonwealth. And whereas in celebrating the holy mysteries after Christ's institution, they took *bread and wine*, they were therefore thought of many to worship, not *Christ* or *God*, but *Bacchus* and *Ceres* : forsomuch as those vain gods were worshipped of the heathens in like sort, after a profane superstition, with *bread and wine*. These things were believed of many, not because they were true indeed, (for what could be more untrue?) but because they were like to be true, and through a certain shadow of truth might the more easily deceive the simple. On this fashion likewise do these men slander us as heretics, and say, that we have left the church and fellowship of Christ : not because they think it is true, for they do not much force of that, but because to ignorant folk it might perhaps some way appear true³⁷.

We have indeed put ourselves apart, not, as heretics are wont, from the church of Christ, but as all good men ought to do, from the infection of naughty persons and hypocrites. Nevertheless, in this point they triumph marvellously, *that they be the church*³⁸; *that their church is Christ's spouse, the pillar of truth, the ark of Noe* : and that without it there is no hope

³⁷ [Harding again inserts a page of useless matter.]
Lat. "illam esse ecclesiam."]

³⁸ [Apol.

of salvation. Contrariwise, they say, *that we be renegades : that we have torn Christ's seat*³⁹ [i. coat] : that we are plucked quite off from the body of Christ, and have forsaken the catholic faith. And when they leave nothing unspoken, that may never so falsely and maliciously be said against us, yet this one thing are they never able truly to say, that we have swerved either from the word of God, or from the apostles of Christ, or from the primitive church. Surely we have ever judged the primitive church of Christ's time, of the apostles, and of the holy fathers, to be the catholic church : neither make we doubt to name it, *Noe's ark, Christ's spouse, the pillar and upholder of all truth* : nor yet to fix therein the whole mean of our salvation. It is doubtless an odious matter for one to leave the fellowship whereunto he hath been accustomed, and specially of those men, who, though they be not, yet at least seem to be, and be called, Christians. And to say truly, we do not despise the church of these men, (howsoever it be ordered by them nowadays,) partly for the name's sake itself, and partly for that the gospel of Jesus Christ hath once been therein truly and purely set forth. Neither had we departed therefrom, but of very necessity, and much against our wills.

M. HARDING.

We grant that in old time slanders were made upon the faithful. But no like slander is made by us upon you in the matter whereof ye speak. For let us grant, that ye have indeed put yourselves apart, and are gone from the contagion of naughty persons and hypocrites. This is the very thing we lay to your charge. For though we were such, as for a great number ye shall never be able to prove, yet by Christ's own sentence ye must do that ^a which they that sit in the chair of Moses bid you

a The same Scribes and Pharisees commanded the people to refuse Christ's company, John ix. and xii. And was the people bound to follow them?

³⁹ [This must be a misprint, which also occurs in the edition of 1570; the original has "Christi tunicam."]

do, although they be hypocrites, as the Scribes and Pharisees were, of whom Christ spake, &c. But it shall be enough for you to do as the successors of Peter bid you to do, and so to follow their saying, and not their doings.....

The primitive church is continued with our time by the successors of St. Peter, for whose faith never to fail Christ prayed, and whom ^b only he made shepherd to feed all his flock of sheep and lambs.....Christ ^c now requireth of you, not to obey Peter and Paul, but to obey him who sitteth in their chair. Where ye say, it is an odious matter to forsake us, and yet have forsaken us : where ye confess that ye despise not the church we be of, and yet grant that ye have departed from it : how standeth this together ? Remember ye what ye say ? know ye what ye do ? Who will regard your word, which with one breath say and unsay ? If it be odious, why do ye it ? If ye despise not the church, why depart ye from it ?

b Untruth.
For Christ
never gave
Peter any
such special
privilege.

c A strange
kind of divi-
nity, such as
Peter and
Paul never
knew.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Christ saith : " The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' chair : do that they say, but do not that they do." *Ergo*, (say you) " we may not depart away from the pope." Howsoever it fare with your *conclusion*, M. Harding, verily in your *premises* ye compare the *pope* and his *cardinals* with the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*. And yet the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* sat in the *chair*, and taught the *law* : your *pope* and *cardinals* sit still, and teach nothing. Notwithstanding, let us well allow of this comparison. Ye may remember that Christ also saith : " Woe be unto you, ye *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, that shut up the kingdom of heaven before men : and neither do you enter in yourselves, nor will you suffer others that fain would enter. Woe be unto you, ye *blind guides* : woe be unto you, that have taken away the *key of knowledge*." Likewise he saith of them unto his disciples :

Matt. xxiii.
13.

Matt. xvi. 6. " Beware of the leaven of the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* : let
Matt. xv. 14. *them go : blind they are, and the leaders of the blind.*"

To sit in Moses' chair, was truly and rightly to instruct the people, and to open unto them the law of Moses. St. Augustine saith : *Hoc ipsum quod bona dicebant, et ea quæ dicebant utiliter audiebantur, et fiebant, non erat ipsorum. Cathedram enim, inquit, Mosi sedent* : " That they spake good things unto the people, and that the things that they said were profitable to the hearers and doers of the same,

Augustin. de
Serm. Dom.
in Mont. lib.
2. [iii. pt. 2,
233.]

it was not of themselves. For Christ saith, ‘*They sit upon Moses’ chair.*’” Again he saith: *Sedendo super cathedram Moysis, legem Dei docent. Ergo per illos Deus docet. Sua vero illi si velint docere, nolite audire: nolite facere. Certe enim tales sua quærunt, non quæ Jesu Christi:* “Sitting upon Moses’ chair, they teach the law of God: therefore it is God that teacheth by the mean of them. But if they will teach you things of their own, then hear them not: then do it not. For certainly such men seek their own, and not the things that pertain to Christ Jesus.” Ye see, therefore, M. Harding, we are bound to hear the *pope* and his *cardinals*, and other like *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, not absolutely, or without exception, whatsoever they list to say; but only so long as they teach the *law of God*. Further than that, St. Augustine saith, “*We may neither hear them nor follow their counsel.*”

Hereunto ye thought it good to add more force, as a supply to aid your wants. Christ said unto Peter, “I have prayed for thee, that thy *faith* shall never fail.” *Ergo*, (say you) “the pope can never err.” This way of reasoning, I trow, ye learned of Peter de Palude, a worthy doctor of your side. For so he reasoneth: *Ego rogavi pro te, Petre, ut fides tua non deficiat. Ex quo habetur, quod Romana ecclesia in fide errare non potest: nec de ejus fide dubitare licet: sed in omnibus est sequenda:* “Peter, ‘I have prayed for thee, that thy faith may not fail.’ By these words we are taught, that the church of Rome cannot err in faith. Neither is it lawful to doubt of the faith of that church: but in all causes we are bound to follow it.” But St. Augustine saith: *Nunquid pro Petro rogabat: pro Johanne et Jacobo non rogabat? Ut cæteros taceam:* “To leave the rest, did Christ pray for Peter: and did he not pray for John and James⁴⁰?” Again he saith: *Hac nocte postulavit Satanas vexare vos, sicut triticum: et ego rogavi Patrem pro vobis [Bened. leg. te], ne deficiat fides vestra [Ben. leg. tua]:* “This night hath Satan begged to thresh you, as if it were wheat: but I have prayed to my Father” (not for Peter only, but) “*for you, that your faith may not*

Augustin. in Joh. tract. 46. [iii. pt. 2. 604.]

Petr. de Palude, de potestate pap. Artic. 4.

Augustin. de quest. Novi Testam. quest. 75. [iii. App. 473.]

Augustin. de Verbis Dom. in Evangel. secund. Lucam, serm. 36. [v. 575.]

⁴⁰ [This is not a genuine work of St. Augustine.]

Orig. in Matt.
tract. i. [iii.
524.]

fail⁴¹." So saith Origen: *Nunquid audebimus dicere, quod adversus unum Petrum non prævalituræ sint portæ inferorum: adversus cæteros autem apostolos, ac præfectos ecclesiæ, sint prævalituræ?.....An Petro soli dantur a Christo claves regni cælorum? Nec alius beatorum quisquam eas accepturus est?.....Omnia quæque prius dicta sunt, quæque sequuntur, velut ad Petrum dicta, sunt omnium communia:* "May we dare to say, that the gates of hell shall not prevail *only* against Peter: but shall prevail against the other *apostles and rulers of the church?* Were the keys of the kingdom of heaven given *only* to Peter? And shall no holy man else receive the same? Nay, all the things, both that were said before, and also that follow after, as spoken to Peter, are common, and belong unto all⁴²." Therefore as ye say of the *church of Rome*, so may we say likewise of the *church of Jerusalem*, where St. James was; and of the *church of Ephesus*, where St. John was; and of other the like *apostolic churches*, notwithstanding they be now in the possession of the Turk, and have received the *religion of Mahomet*, yet, because Christ hath once prayed for them, the faith of them shall never fail.

Now if the churches of Galatia, Corinth, Ephesus, Jerusalem, and of infinite other noble cities and countries, planted by Paul, by John, by James, and by Christ himself, may fail from the faith, what special privilege then,

⁴¹ [Bishop Jewel quotes from Erasm. ed. of St. Augustine's works, vol. x. col. 137, where the reading of the whole of this passage is as he represents it: the Benedictine editors have altered it, without assigning any reason; but probably with the view of assimilating it to the words of the Gospel.]

⁴² [Origen. Εἰ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν ἔνα ἐκείνον Πέτρον νομίζεις ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ οἰκοδομεῖσθαι τὴν πᾶσαν ἐκκλησίαν μόνον, τί ἂν φήσας περὶ Ἰωάννου, τοῦ τῆς βροντῆς νιού, ἢ ἐκάστου τῶν ἀποστόλων; ἄλλως τε ἂρα τολμήσωμεν λέγειν ὅτι Πέτρου μὲν ἰδίως πύλαι ἄδου οὐ κατ-

ισχύσουσι, τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν τελείων κατισχύουσιν; οὐχὶ δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ ἐφ' ἐκάστῳ αὐτῶν τὸ προειρημένον, τό πύλαι ἄδου οὐ κατισχύουσιν αὐτῆς, γίνεται; καὶ τό. ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν; ἄρα δὲ τῷ Πέτρῳ μόνῳ δίδονται ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου αἱ κλείδες τῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἕτερος τῶν μακαρίων αὐτὰς λήψεται; εἰ δὲ κοινόν ἐστι καὶ πρὸς ἑτέρους τό δώσω σοι τὰς κλείδας τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, πῶς οὐχὶ καὶ πάντα τὰ τε προειρημένα, καὶ τὰ ἐπιφερόμενα, ὥς πρὸς Πέτρον λελεγεμένα; κ. τ. λ.]

may we imagine, hath the *church of Rome*, planted by Peter, that it only of all others *can never fail*? For Christ prayed indifferently, as well for the rest of his apostles, as for Peter, that their faith should never fail.

Further ye tell us: "It shall be enough for you to do as the successors of Peter bid you to do. Christ now" (you say) "requireth not of you to obey Peter and Paul; but to obey him that sitteth in their chair." If this way be as sure as it is short, then is there no doubt but all is well. Though we believe neither Peter, nor Paul, nor whatsoever is written in God's word, yet, say you, *If we follow the pope, we cannot err*. For thus much, M. Harding, ye are able to warrant us by your gospel, that Christ requireth not us now to be *obedient to Peter and Paul, but only to the pope's holiness*, that keepeth residence in their *chair*. This is your *divinity*: these are your words. If ye ever recant the same, ye mar the flower of your market. We need not now to say, *Thus saith the Lord*: it shall be sufficient for us to say, *Thus saith the pope*. Yet St. Paul so far adventureth the truth and certainty of his *doctrine*, that he doubteth not to say, "If an angel from heaven preach Galat. i. 8. unto you any other gospel than we have preached, accursed be he." Upon which words St. Chrysostom hath noted thus: *Non dixit, Si contraria annuntiaverint, aut totum evangelium subverterint: verum, Si paulum evangelizaverint* Chrysost. in 1 cap. ad Galat. [x. 670.] *præter evangelium quod accepistis, etiamsi quidvis labefactaverint, anathema sint*: "St. Paul saith not, If they preach contrary to the gospel, or overthrow the whole gospel: but, If they preach any little thing besides the gospel that ye have received: if they *overthrow any thing, whatsoever it be, accursed be they* ⁴³." Therefore St. Hierom saith: *Ea doceat episcopus, quæ a Deo didicerit, non ex proprio corde*, &c.: "Let the bishop teach those things that he hath learned of God, and not of his own heart or fancy."

Chrysostom saith: *Plus aliquid dicam: ne Paulo quidem obedire oportet, si quid dixerit proprium, si quid* Chrysost. in 2 Tim. hom. 2. [xi. 669.]

⁴³ [Chrysost. ad Galat. Καὶ οὐκ μικρόν τι εὐαγγελίζονται παρ' ὃ εἶπεν, ἐὰν ἐναντία καταγγέλλωσιν, εὐηγγελισάμεθα, καὶ τὸ τυχὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ ἀνατρέψωσιν τὸ πᾶν, ἀλλὰ, καὶ ρακινήσωσιν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστωσαν.]

humanum: sed apostolo Christum in se loquentem circumferenti: “I will tell you a greater matter: we may not obey, no not St. Paul himself, if he speak any thing of his own, or if he speak only as a man: but we must believe the apostle of Christ, carrying Christ about speaking within him ⁴⁴.”

De Elect. et
Elect. potest.
Significasti.
Abb. [Panor.
tom. 1. pt. 1.
fol. 122. col.
1.]

And therefore Panormitane saith: *In concernentibus fidem, etiam dictum unius privati esset præferendum dicto papæ: si ille moveretur melioribus rationibus Novi et Veteris Testamenti, quam papa:* “In matters concerning faith, the saying of one *private man* were to be heard before the saying of the *pope*, if the same *private man* were moved with better reasons of the New and Old Testament, than the *pope*.” But *that we should no longer obey Peter and Paul, but give ear only to him that is crosen into their chair*, it is such *divinity*, as neither Peter nor Paul ever taught us.

Last of all, as upon some good advantage, ye begin to triumph. “Remember ye” (say ye) “what ye say? know ye what ye do? Who will regard your word, which with one breath say and unsay? If it be odious to leave our fellowship, why do ye it? If ye despise not the church, why depart ye from it?” To *say* and *unsay*, it is your property, M. Harding: it is not ours. Ye have *said* and *unsaid*, and yet, were it not for shame, it is thought ye would be contented to *say* again. We despise not the church: it is the house of God. But we mislike your defacing and disordering of the church. Christ reproveth

Matt. xxi. 13. the *priests* and *Pharisees*, for that they had turned the *temple of God into a cave of thieves*: and yet nevertheless he despised it not: but said it was his *Father's house*. To leave the wicked fellowship of them that bear a name and show of godliness, it seemeth odious before men: but before God it is not odious. St. John saith: “Whosoever is such a one, bid him not God speed. For whoso saith God speed unto him, is partaker of his ill.” St. Paul saith:

⁴⁴ [Chrysost. in 2 Tim. Καὶ τί ἀλλὰ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ, τῷ τὸν Χριστὸν λέγων; οὐδὲ Παύλῳ πείθεσθαι χρή, ἔχοντι λαλοῦντα ἐν ἑαυτοῖς.]
ἂν τι ἴδιον λέγῃ, ἂν τι ἀνθρώπινον,

“ I warn you, that you receive no meat with any such.” 1 Cor. v. 11.
 And God himself saith: “ Come out from her, O my Rev. xviii. 4.
 people, lest ye be partakers of her sins, and lest ye receive
 of her plagues.” Thus we *say* not, and *unsay* again, as
 you say, M. Harding. For the same thing we *said* before,
 we *say* still.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 9. Divis. 3.

But I put case an idol be set up in the church of
 God, and the same desolation, which Christ prophe-
 sied to come, stood openly in the holy place. What
 if some thief or pirate invade and possess *Noe's ark*?
 These folks, as often as they tell us of the *church*,
 mean thereby themselves alone, and attribute all
 these titles to their own selves, boasting, as they
 did in times past, that cried out, *The temple of the*
Lord, The temple of the Lord: or as the Pharisees
 and Scribes did, which craked they were *Abraham's*
children. Thus with a gay and jolly show deceive
 they the simple, and seek to choke us with the bare
 name of the church. Much like as if a thief, when
 he hath gotten into another man's house, and by
 violence either hath thrust out or slain the owner,
 should afterward assign the same house to himself,
 casting forth of possession the right inheritor: or, if
Antichrist, when he had once entered into the *temple*
of God, should afterward say, This house is mine
 own, and Christ hath nothing to do withal. For
 these men now, after they have left nothing remain-
 ing in the church of God that hath any likeness of
 his church, yet will they seem the patrons and the
 valiant maintainers of the church. Verily like as
 Gracchus amongst the Romans stood sometime in
 defence of the treasury, notwithstanding with his
 prodigality and fond expenses he had utterly wasted
 the whole stock of the treasury. And yet was there
 never any thing so wicked, or so far out of reason,

but lightly it might be covered and defended by the name of the *church*. For the wasps also make honeycombs as well as bees, although there be no honey in them⁴⁵: and wicked men have companies like to the *church of God*: yet for all that, *they be not straightway the people of God which are called the people of God: neither be they all Israelites, as many as are come of Israel the father*. The Arians, notwithstanding they were *heretics*, yet bragged they that they alone were the *catholics*, calling all the rest, now *Ambrosians*⁴⁶, now *Athasians*, now *Johannites*. And Nestorius, as saith Theodoret, for all that he was an *heretic*, yet covered he himself τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας προσχήματι: that is to wit, with a certain cloak and colour of the true and right faith. Ebion, though he agreed in opinion with the Samaritans, yet, as saith Epiphanius, he would needs be called a *Christian*. The Mahometists at this day, for all that all histories make plain mention, and themselves also cannot deny, but they took their first beginning of *Agar the bondwoman*, yet for the very name and stock's sake choose they rather to be called *Saracens*, as though they came of *Sara the free woman, and Abraham's true and lawful wife*. So likewise the *false prophets* of all ages, which stood up against the *prophets of God*, and resisted Esaias, Jeremy, Christ, and the apostles, at no time craked of any thing so much, as they did of the name of the *church*. And for none other cause did they so fiercely vex them, and call them *renegades and apostates*, than for that they had forsaken their fellowship, and kept not the ordinances of the *elders*. Wherefore if we would follow the judgments of those men only, who then

Augustin. in Sermon. contra Arianos, tom. 6. [viii. 646.]

Augustin. in Epist. 48. ad Vincent. [ii. 240.]

Epiphani. lib. 1. haeres. 30. [i. 125.]

Sozomen. lib. 6. cap. 38. [ii. 276.]

⁴⁵ [The original has simply, "faciunt etiam vespæ favos."]

⁴⁶ [In Augustine's sermon contra Arianos, all that is said is that the Arians called the orthodox Homoeousians.]

governed the church, and would respect nothing else, neither God nor his word, it must needs be confessed, that the *apostles* were rightly and by just law condemned of them to death, because they fell from the *bishops and priests*, that is, you must think, from the *catholic church*: and because they made new alterations in religion, contrary to the *bishops' and priests'* wills, yea, and for all their spurning so earnestly against it.

M. HARDING.

.....What a foolish put case, and what a fond "what if" is that, to say, What if a pirate invade the ark of Noe? ^a As though God sat not at the stern, and had the helm in his own hand.....

^b Antichrist cannot sit in the temple of God ^c until the vicar of Christ, who keepeth possession, be thrown out, and then will Christ come with his angels to destroy the wicked man with the breath of his mouth. Ye that are the harbingers of Antichrist, are not yet able to cast out the lieutenant of Christ. Ye heave at the under ministers. Your master will accomplish all iniquity, and he shall be the desolation that Christ spake of. We understand what ye shoot at. But ye are ashamed to utter plainly your blasphemy. ^d Ye would say (as it may seem) if ye durst, that Christ is the desolation, and that Antichrist is the true God. ^e In effect I do not greatly belie you.....

Neither, if the apostles might go from the bishops of Moses' law, therefore may ye depart from the vicar of Christ. For the law of Moses is changed, and the priesthood of Aaron is transferred: but the law and priesthood of Jesus Christ tarrieth for ever, as David said, "Thou art a priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedech." Ye halt too manifestly.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

"Antichrist" (ye say) "cannot sit in the temple of God until the vicar of Christ, who keepeth possession, be thrown out." What say you, M. Harding? Doth Christ's vicar keep possession for *Antichrist*? As for Christ himself, I doubt not but he is able to keep his own possession. But so the *old Trojans* sometime said, their city could never miscarry, while their *palladium* remained amongst them. But who told you these strange news, M. Harding? Who made the *pope Christ's vicar general* throughout the whole

^a As though St. Paul had not warned us that Antichrist shall sit, and shew himself in the place of Christ.

^b Ergo, Antichrist shall sit in the pope's chair. ^c But what if Christ's vicar himself be Antichrist?

^d Untruth, malicious and slanderous.

^e Ergo, ye belie us, although not greatly.

^a Thess. ii.

Matt. xxiv.

^a Thess. ii.

church? or who bade him keep possession instead of Christ? Must we needs think that the whole state of Christ's church hangeth only of the *pope*? or that if the *pope* were not the *pope*, the *church* of Christ were not the *church*? or must your simple word now be taken for a prophecy, that *Antichrist* shall never enter into God's *temple* before the *pope* be thrown out? This fable would have been better furnished with more credit.

Verily whereas we say, *We put case an idol be set up in the church of God*: or, *What if some thief or pirate invade and possess Noe's ark*: neither is this '*what if*' so *fond* as you would seem to make it: nor this '*put case*' so *impossible*. For St. Paul saith: "*Antichrist* shall sit in the church of God, and shew himself above all that is worshipped, or called God:" that is to say, being a *thief* and a *pirate*, he shall enter perforce into *Noe's ark*.

Now, M. Harding, if *Antichrist* may sit in the *place of God*, much more may he sit in the *place of Peter*. I will not say the *pope* is *Antichrist*. God will reveal him in his time, and he shall be known. St. John saith: "This is the wisdom: whoso hath understanding, let him reckon the number of the beast." Upon which words Irenæus, well near fifteen hundred years ago, saith thus: "The name of *Antichrist*, expressed by that number, shall be *Latinus*:" and he addeth further: *Hoc valde verisimile est: quoniam verissimum* [Ben. leg. *novissimum*] *regnum hoc habet vocabulum* ⁴⁷.

Irenæus, lib. 5. cap. ult. [p. 329.]

Gregor. lib. 4 38. [ii. 744.] Sacerdotum paratus est exercitus.

St. Gregory saith: "He is *Antichrist* that shall claim to be called the universal bishop; and shall have a *guard of priests* ⁴⁸ to attend upon him." Again Irenæus saith:

⁴⁷ [Irenæus lib. 5. The Froben. ed. used by bishop Jewel reads "*verissimum*:" the Bened. "*novissimum*," and they shew the error of the earlier edd. in printing "*Latinus*" instead of *Λατίνος*. The passage is as follows: "Sed et *Λατίνος* nomen habet sexcentorum sexaginta sex numerum; et valde verisimile est, quoniam *novissimum* regnum

"hoc habet vocabulum. Latini enim sunt qui nunc regnant."]

⁴⁸ [Bishop Jewel found in the MSS. the reading "*exercitus*," which has been adopted by the Bened. edd. The earlier editions read "*exitus*." See note ⁸¹ supra, vol. ii. p. 142; also James's "*Corruptions of the Fathers*," p. 230, ed. 1688.]

Antichristus, cum sit servus, tamen adorari vult ut Deus: Irenæus, lib. 5. cap. penult. [p. 322.]
 “*Antichrist*, notwithstanding he be but a slave, yet he will be worshipped, as if he were God ⁴⁹.” Joachinus Abbas saith: *Antichristus jam pridem natus est Romæ, et altius extolletur in sede apostolica:* Joachi. Abbas. “*Antichrist* is long sithence born in Rome, and yet shall be higher advanced in the apostolic see.”

Thus is he described, that shall sit in the *place of Christ*, and shall maintain possession against Christ. But *Christ* ^{2 Thess. ii. 4.} shall come with his holy angels, and shall destroy him with the breath of his mouth, which is the holy Word of the living God.

That ye allege of the *priesthood of Melchisedech*, serveth you here to small purpose. We know that, *not the pope*, but *Christ alone* is a priest for ever, according to the *order of Melchisedech*. St. Augustine saith: *Ipse est sacerdos noster in æternum, secundum ordinem Melchisedech, qui semetipsum obtulit holocaustum pro peccatis nostris: et ejus sacrificii similitudinem celebrandam in suæ passionis memoriam commendavit:* August. in lib. 83. quæst. qu. 61. [vi. 34.] “Christ is our priest for ever after the *order of Melchisedech*, which hath offered up himself a sacrifice for our sins, and hath delivered unto us a similitude or likeness of that sacrifice, to be done in remembrance of his passion.” Therefore if ye will say, *The pope is a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedech*, then must you also say, *The pope hath offered himself a sacrifice for the sins of the world.*

Likewise again he saith: *Holocausti ejus imaginem ad memoriam passionis suæ in ecclesia celebrandam dedit, ut esset sacerdos in æternum: non secundum ordinem Aaron, sed secundum ordinem Melchisedech:* In ead. quæst. [p. 35.] “Christ hath given an image or resemblance of that sacrifice, to be kept in the church in remembrance of his passion, that he might be a priest for ever, not after the *order of Aaron*, but after the *order of Melchisedech.*”

⁴⁹ [Irenæus lib. 5. cap. penult. . . . quoniam existens apostata et latro, quasi Deus vult adorari, et, cum sit servus, regem se vult præconari.]

Artic. 17. Div-
vist 15. [sup.
vol. iii. 378.]

Howbeit, touching this whole matter, I have answered more at large in my former Reply.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 9. Divis. 4.

Wherefore, like as it is written, that Hercules in ^[Vol. iv. p. 47.] old time was forced, in striving with Antæus that huge giant, to lift him quite up from the *earth*, that was his *mother*, ere he could conquer him, even so must our adversaries be heaved from their *mother*, that is, from this vain colour and shadow of the church, wherewith they so disguise and defend themselves: otherwise they cannot be brought to yield unto the word of God. And therefore saith Jeremy the prophet, Make not such great boast, that the *temple of the Lord* is with you. This is but a vain confidence: these are but lies. The angel also saith in the Apocalypse: "They say they be Jews: but they be the *synagogue of Satan*." And Christ said to the Pharisees, when they vaunted themselves of the kindred and blood of Abraham: "*Ye are of your father the devil*:" for you resemble not your father Abraham: as much to say as, Ye are not the men ye would so fain be called: ye beguile the people with vain titles, and abuse the name of the church, to the overthrowing of the church.

John viii. 44.

M. HARDING.

.....Heave at us whiles ye will, and whiles ye may, ye shall never remove us. In which steadfastness we trust to stand by God's grace to the last breath. Heave at us with all forces of your cunning, of your malice, of your flattery, of your policies, and with whatsoever engines ye have; ye shall never be able to overthrow the house of our consciences, builded upon the sure rock. Let the goulders of rain come down from you and all ^{Matt. vii.} other heretics, let the floods of worldly rages thrust, let the winds of Satan's temptations blow their worst, this house shall not be overthrown.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

O, M. Harding, St. Paul saith unto you, *Noli altum sapere, sed time*: “Presume not of yourself, but stand in awe.” Such words would rather have becomed them that said sometime unto the prophet Jeremy, *Verbum quod locutus es nobis in nomine Domini, non audiemus: sed faciendo faciemus omne verbum quod egredietur de ore nostro*: “We will never hear the word that thou speakest unto us in the name of the Lord. But we will surely do whatsoever thing shall pass out of our own mouths.” Thus it is written of them that said, “The Lord shall not bear rule over, nor master us.” With like mildness of spirit the wilful philosopher said: *Non persuadebis, etiamsi persuaseris*: “Ye shall not make me believe it, no though I do believe it.”

Rom. xi. 20.

Jer. xlv. 16.

Luke xix. 14.

οὐ πείσεις,
οὐδ' ἔν
πείσης.
[Aristoph.
Plutus, l.
600.]

As constancy in good things is a virtue, so frowardness and wilfulness is a vice. Vow not thus your own destruction. He that is fallen may rise again. The Lord is able to raise you up, and to make you a vessel of his glory. Ye know not to what good purpose God hath appointed you. Speak not overmuch of the strength of your mount. You know upon how light occasions it hath been moved. Follow rather St. Paul's counsel, and “with fear and trembling work your own salvation.” The way ye walk in is not your own. Your heart is in the hand of God. Suffer God's truth to prevail: and understand, that the kingdom of God is come unto you.

Phil. ii. 12.

Jer. x. 23.

Luke xi. 20.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 10. Divis. 1.

[Vol. iv. p.
47.]

So that these men's part had been, first to have clearly and truly proved, that the *Romish church* is the true and right instructed *church of God*: and that the same, as they do order it at this day, doth agree with the primitive church of Christ, of the apostles, and of the holy fathers, which we doubt not but was indeed [the] true catholic church.

M. HARDING.

Ye would us to prove, that the Roman church is the true church of God. Ye grant that once it was the true church of God. And the gospel sheweth, that Christ prayed for it in St. Peter, who made his successors there. ^a What followeth hereof, ^{Luke xxii. 32.} but that it must needs abide as true as ever it was, except Christ's prayer were not heard? St. Paul likewise witnesseth, that the Roman faith is preached in the universal world, giving a manifest prophesy, that the Roman faith and the catholic faith should be all one. St. Cyprian calleth the agreeing with the bishop of Rome, and communicating with him, *catholica ecclesie unitatem*, &c.: the allowing and firm holding of the unity of the catholic church. And writing to Antonianus in the same book, he accounteth it for one thing to communicate with Cornelius the bishop of Rome, and to communicate with the catholic church. For you it is vain to say, that it hath erred, ^b when the Holy Ghost hath signified that it cannot err.

^a This is a very vain hope. For Christ prayed for the other apostles no less than for Peter.

^b Untruth. For where did the Holy Ghost ever make such promise?

¹ Lib. iv. epist. 8. [p. 59.]

[p. 66.]

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

I will not say, where were your wits, M. Harding, when ye wrote these things? but well may I say, where was your *logic*? As for *divinity*, it appeareth by your reckoning, ye make no great account of it. "Christ (say you) "prayed for Peter: *ergo*, the Roman faith can never fail." Few children would willingly make such arguments. Ye presume very much of the simplicity and ignorance of your reader. For think you, that Christ prayed only for Peter, and for nobody else? or think you, that Christ's prayers took place in none other of all the *apostles*, but only in *Peter*? Awake for shame, and shake off these dreams.

John xvii. 20. Christ himself saith: "O Father, I pray *not only for these*, but also for them that by their word shall believe in me."

And St. Augustine thus reporteth the same prayer, as it is alleged before: *Ego rogavi Patrem pro vobis*, [Bened. leg. *te*] *ne deficiat fides vestra* [Bened. leg. *tua*]: "I have prayed unto my Father" (not for *Peter* only, but) "for you, that your faith may not fail ⁵⁰." Again he saith: *Nunquid pro Petro rogabat? pro Johanne et Jacobo non rogabat?* "Did Christ pray for *Peter*? and did he not

Augustin. de Verbis Dom. in Evangel. secund. Lucam, serm. 36. [v. 575.] August. in quest. Novi Test. quest. 75. [liii. App. 73.]

⁵⁰ [The Froben. ed. reads "vobis" and "vestra." Supra vol. v. p. 452, note ⁴¹.]

pray for *John* and *James* ⁵¹?" Certainly Origen saith, as likewise I have before alleged: *Omnia, quæque prius dicta sunt, quæque sequuntur, velut ad Petrum dicta, sunt omnium communia*: "All the things that either passed before, or follow after, as spoken unto *Peter*, are common unto all the *apostles* ⁵²." Origen. in Matt. tract. i. [iii. 525.]

But St. Paul saith unto the Romans: "Your faith is spoken of throughout the world." And St. Cyprian saith: "The agreeing with the *bishop of Rome* was the unity of the catholic church." And yet it may please you to be remembered by the way, that the same St. Cyprian re-proved Cornelius and Stephanus, both *bishops of Rome*: and told them they were both deceived: and therefore would not agree unto them. Nevertheless hereof ye conclude thus: *Ergo*, "the Holy Ghost hath signified, that the church of Rome cannot err." It pitieth me, M. Harding, in your behalf, to see into how strait and miserable holes ye are fain to creep. For what if the *faith* and the *constancy* of the Romans in old times, for the nobility of that empire and city, were then published throughout the whole world? yet where did the Holy Ghost ever tell you, that therefore the *church of Rome* should never err? By what word? by what promise? by what revelation? Ye say: "The faith of the Romans was heard of throughout the whole world." So was the *great capitol* there. So was the beauty of their princely buildings: which notwithstanding are now made smooth, and even with the ground. So likewise is it written of Jerusalem: *De Sion* Rom. i. 8. *exibit lex, et verbum Domini de Hierusalem*: "The law shall come forth from Sion, and the word of God from Jerusalem." So in the *city of Antioch* the faithful were first called *Christians*: and therefore Chrysostom calleth the same city *Caput totius orbis*: "The head of the whole world ⁵³." Thus was Eusebius Samosatensis called *Regula fidei*: "The rule and standard of the faith." Thus was Athanasius called, *Orbis oculus, et fundamentum fidei*: Chrysost. ad Popul. Antioch. hom. 3. [ii. 36.] Nazian. epist. 74. [al. 44. ii. 39.] Nazian. ad Heronem. [i. 462.]

⁵¹ [Not a genuine work of St. Augustine's.]

⁵² [Supra vol. v. p. 452, note 42.]

⁵³ [Supra vol. ii. p. 280.]

"The eye of the world, and the foundation of the faith." Would ye hereof conclude, M. Harding, that therefore the faith of these churches can never fail? Ye know that, all this notwithstanding, the churches, as well of Jerusalem and Antioch, as also of Asia, Syria, Græcia, and of all the east, are now subject to the Turk, and scarcely a few left there, that dare to profess the name of Christ.

As St. Paul saith to the Romans, "Your faith is spoken of throughout all the world," even so saith he to the Thessalonians, "Your faith is carried abroad into all places:" *1 Thess. i. 8.* *In omni loco fides vestra quæ est in Deum dimanavit:* the words be like: the sense is one. Will you therefore tell us, the *Thessalonians'* faith shall never fail? Verily at this day there is no sparkle of *faith* left there. For the Christians are banished and thrust out; and the city is fully possessed with Jews, which are the enemies of the cross of Christ.

What a fond paradise is this, to say, *because ye had once the faith of Christ, therefore now ye can never err?* Such a phantastical paradise had they built unto themselves, that cried out in old times, even as you do now, *The temple of God: the temple of God: we are the children of Abraham.* But whosoever well considereth the story of the time, shall soon find, that then they cried most *The temple of God*, when they had most shamefully abused and defaced the *temple of God*: and that then they claimed most to be called the *children of Abraham*, when they had forsaken both the *faith* and *life* of *Abraham*, and, as Christ saith *John viii. 44.* unto them, *were become the children of the devil.*

Such a phantasy had they that said, *Non peribit lex a sacerdote: nec consilium a sapiente: nec verbum a propheta:* "The law shall not depart from the priest: nor counsel from the wise: nor the word from the prophet." *Jer. xviii. 18.*

But God saith unto them: *Obstupescant sacerdotes, et prophetæ terrebuntur.* *Ezek. vii. 26.* *Lex peribit a sacerdote, et consilium a senioribus.* *Mic. 6. [leg. iii. 6.]* *Nox vobis erit pro visione: et tenebræ pro divinatione:* "Your priests shall be amazed: and your prophets shall be at their wits' end. The law shall perish from the priest: and counsel shall want in the elders. Ye shall

have night instead of a vision: and darkness instead of prophecy."

St. Paul saith unto the Galatians: "Ye began well: Gal. iii. 1. who hath thus bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth?" St. Peter saith: "As there were false prophets 2 Pet. ii. 1. amongst the people in old time, even so among you there shall be false prophets, bringing in sects of perdition." Of such a change the prophet Esay complaineth: *Quo- Isa. i. 21. modo facta est meretrix civitas fidelis!* "How is this faithful city now become an *harlot!*" Deceive not thus yourself, M. Harding, with vain hope. Hearken rather to the voice of our Lord. Put nothing to his word: take nothing from the same: turn neither to the right hand nor to the left: so shall ye be sure ye shall not err.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 10. Divis. 2.

[Vol. iv. p.
47.]

For our parts, if we could have judged *ignorance, error, superstition, idolatry*, men's *inventions*, and the same commonly disagreeing with the holy scriptures, either to please God, or to be sufficient for the obtaining of everlasting salvation: or if we could ascertain ourselves, that the word of God was written but for a time only, and afterward again ought to be abrogated and put away: or else, that the sayings and commandments of God ought to be subject to man's will, that whatsoever God saith and commandeth, except the bishop of Rome will and command the same, it must be taken as void and unspoken: if we could have brought ourselves to believe these things, we grant there had been no cause at all, why we should have left these men's company.

M. HARDING.

God forbid that either ye or any Christian man should judge, that ignorance, error, superstition, idolatry, men's inventions contrary to the scriptures, either pleased God, or to be sufficient to salvation. Because ye lay this to the catholic church,

JEWEL, VOL. V.

H h

a Untruth inclosed, known, and wilful. Read the answer.
 b Thus partly M. Harding's doctors say: partly M. Harding himself, as it shall appear.

a we can say no less of you but that ye be false liars and devilish slanderers. And ^b who teacheth that God's word was written but for a time only? ^b that his commandments be subject to man's will? ^b that God's sayings and precepts be void, except the bishop of Rome ratify them? Here would I say unto you at least, Fie for shame, but that I think I should prevail no more than if I said to an impudent and common harlot, Fie for shame. Who may not plainly see the scripture verified on you, *Frons Jer. iii. mulieris meretricis facta est vobis?* "Ye have gotten to you the impudent face of an harlot".....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here, M. Harding, it hath pleased you to bestow large liveries of your *false liars, devilish slanderers, impudent faces, common harlots*: with *fies* and *shame*, &c. Wherein no man may justly grudge you to be so liberal of your own. First, that by your doctrine *ignorance highly pleaseth God*, and *is sufficient to salvation*; besides the general practice of your whole church, ye may soon call to mind, that one of your dearest friends ⁵³, in most honourable audience, not long sithence openly published the same, in the name and behoof of all his brethren, as a *secret mystery*, and the very bottoms of your *divinity*: *Ignorance is the mother of devotion*. You know, M. Harding, that a great many, both worthy and honourable, are able to witness, that this is neither *false lie* nor *devilish slander*. You know, that cardinal Cusanus teacheth you, *Obedientia irrationalis est consummata obedientia, et perfectissima, scilicet, quando obeditur sine inquisitione rationis, sicut jumentum obedit domino suo. Si igitur videas pontificem tuum non communicare alicui, neque tu illi communices. Ecce quantum peccant, qui detrahunt pontifici, &c.*: "Obedience without reason is the full and most perfect obedience; I mean, when a man is obedient to do whatsoever he is commanded without requiring of any reason, even as a horse is obedient to his master. Therefore if thou see thy bishop to refuse the communion of any man, refuse thou to communicate with the same. O how much they offend that slander their bishop!" This, M. Harding, is your doctrine of simple ignorance. Concerning *superstition* and *idolatry*,

Nicol. Cusan.
 Excit. lib. 6.
 Ubi Ecclesia.
 [p. 547.]

⁵³ [The person alluded to is Dr. Cole; supra vol. i. p. 93, and iii. 485.]

what need we many words? The thing itself is too well able to prove itself. Whoso but looketh into your churches may easily not only see it with his eyes, but also feel it with his fingers. That *God's holy word*, by your learning, *is mutable, and serveth only for a time*, your own doctor cardinalis Cusanus would soon have taught you: notwithstanding, it may scarcely seem lawful for you, being so learned a man, in the substance of your own doctrine, to plead ignorance. Cardinal Cusanus' words be these: *Scripturæ adaptatæ sunt ad tempus et varie intelliguntur: ita ut uno tempore secundum currentem universalem ritum exponantur: mutato ritu, iterum sententia mutetur*: "The scriptures are applied unto the time, and may have sundry understandings: so that at one time they may be expounded" (one way) "according to the universal current order" (of the church), "and that, the same order being broken, the meaning of the scriptures may be changed." Look better on your books, M. Harding, and ye shall see, that herein is neither *lie* nor *slander*. That the *holy scriptures of God*, by your divinity, be not authenticall, farther than they be ratified by the *pope*, ye might have learned of your Sylvester Prierias, master of the pope's palace. Thus he writeth:.....*A doctrina Ro-*
manæ ecclesiæ, et Romani pontificis, sacra scriptura robur
trahit et auctoritatem: "The holy scripture taketh strength
 and authority of the doctrine of the Roman church, and of
 the bishop of Rome." Again he saith: *Indulgentiæ au-*
thoritate scripturæ non innotuere nobis: sed auctoritate
Romanæ ecclesiæ, Romanorumque pontificum, quæ major
est: "Pardons are not known to us by the authority of
 the scriptures, but by the authority of the Roman church,
 and of the bishops of Rome, which is greater than the au-
 thority of the scriptures."

Cardin. Cu-
 san. ad Bo-
 hem. ep. 2.
 [p. 833.]

Sylvest. Prie-
 rius contra
 Lutherum.
 [Dialog.
 Fund. 3.]

If ye say these be *lies* and *slanders*, ye offer great wrong to your own doctors, making them the *authors of lies* and *slanders*. Nevertheless, if ye shall happen to cry out in the impatience of your choler, *Fie for shame: impudent faces: common harlots*: remember what you yourself have written immediately before touching the same. These be

M. Harding,
fol. 192. b.

your own words: recant them ye may; but deny them ye may not. Thus you say: "*Christ now requireth of you, not to obey Peter and Paul,*" (that is to say, the *word of God*), "*but to obey him who sitteth in their chair.*" We forge not these words, M. Harding: they are your own. Folks will think ye have no *modest matron's* face, if ye speak willingly against yourself.

Cardin. Cusan, ad Bohemos, ep. 2.
[p. 833.]

Now ye see, M. Harding, who teacheth you, that *God's word was written only for a time*: and that *God's commandments are no further authenticall, but as they be ratified by the pope*. Therefore henceforth ye may spare these *lies* and *slanders*, and cry out *Fie* and *Shame* when some occasion shall be offered. Indeed cardinal Cusanus saith: *Veritas adhæret cathedræ. Quare membra cathedræ unita, et pontifici conjuncta, efficiunt ecclesiam*: "*The truth cleaveth fast to the pope's chair*. Therefore the members united unto that chair, and joined unto the pope, make the church."

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 11. Divis. 1.

As touching that we have now done, to depart ^[Vol. iv. p. 48.] from that *church*, whose errors were proved and made manifest to the world, which *church* also had already evidently departed from *God's word*: and yet not to depart so much from itself, as from the errors thereof; and not to do this disorderly, or wickedly, but quietly and soberly, we have done nothing herein against the doctrine either of *Christ* or of *his apostles*. For neither is the church of God such, as it may not be dusked with some spot, or asketh not sometime reparation. Else what need there so many *assemblies and councils*, without the which, as saith Ægidius, the *Christian faith* is not able to stand? "*For look*" (saith he) "*how often councils are discontinued, so often is the church destitute of Christ.*"

In Concil.
Lateran. sub
Julio 2.
[Hard. ix.
1577 b.]

M. HARDING.

.....That the church in points of our faith necessary to salvation erreth, we deny it: and ^a upon warrant of Christ's promise we tell it you all assuredly, ye shall never be able to prove it.

Councils are kept and bishops be made by the same providence of God, which provideth partly by that means, and partly by other, that the Roman faith, chair, and rock, shall stand for ever. *Ad quos* (saith St. Cyprian, speaking of them of Rome) *perfidia non potest habere accessum*: ^b "To the which unfaithfulness cannot have access." He saith not only, "shall not have access," but "cannot have access."⁵⁴

^a Untruth. Ye make your own warrant. For Christ never made such promise to the church of Rome.
^b Untruth, grounded upon gross ignorance. For M. Harding foully mistaketh St. Cyprian's whole meaning.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

It seemeth, M. Harding, ye have been brought up under some poor unskilful chirurgien [cd. 1570, surgian]. For ye apply one salve to every sore. Whatsoever be alleged against you, it is sufficient for you to answer, *The church of Rome erreth not: The church of Rome hath not erred: The church of Rome cannot err*. And to this purpose ye have brought us in certain words of St. Cyprian, far besides the author's meaning. Whereby it appeareth, that sometimes ye allege authorities of the *fathers*, not considering, neither to what end they spake, nor what they meant.

For whereas St. Cyprian saith, "*Unto the Romans unfaithfulness can have no access*," he speaketh not of the *unfaithfulness* of *faith* or *doctrine*, as you by error have imagined, but only of the *unfaithfulness* of *report*. The cause of writing that epistle, in short, was this: Certain lewd fellows, refusing to stand to the judgment of the bishops of their own country of Africa, appealed further, and fled to Rome, with many untrue and forged tales, to win some credit to their cause. Hereunto St. Cyprian saith: "The Romans be godly and wise men: they will soon be able to espy their falsehood. For unfaithful reports and lewd tales can have no access unto them." If ye had considered either the occasion of the writing, or the whole drift of the letter, or the very bare words as they lie, ye might easily have seen that this only was St. Cyprian's meaning.

⁵⁴ [Harding attempts to explain the words of Ægidius.]

Cyprian, lib.
1. epist. 3. [p.
86.]

His words be these: *Post ista, adhuc insuper pseudo-episcopo sibi ab hæreticis constituto, navigare audent, et ad Petri cathedram,.....*⁵⁵ *unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est, a schismaticis et profanis literas ferre: nec cogitare eos esse Romanos, quorum fides, apostolo prædicante, laudata est: ad quos perfidia habere non possit accessum:* “After this, having a false bishop appointed unto them by heretics, they dare to take shipping, and unto Peter’s chair, and unto that principal church, from whence the priestly unity grew first, to carry letters from schismatics and lewd men: neither consider they, that the Romans are that people, whose faith is praised by St. Paul the apostle: *unto whom unfaithfulness*” (of reports and tales) “*can have no access.*”

In eadem
epist. [p. 86.]

If ye doubt of this exposition, read these words touching the same, going before in the same epistle: *Romam cum mendaciorum suorum merce navigarunt. Quasi veritas post eos navigare non posset: quæ mendaces linguas rei certa probatione convinceret:* “They sail to Rome with the merchandise of their lies: as though the truth could not sail after them, that by proof of the certainty might control their lying tongues.” This is that *unfaithfulness*, that St. Cyprian speaketh of: and not the *unfaithfulness* of *faith* and *doctrine*.

Now touching this appealing and fleeing to Rome, lest ye should think, by occasion of these words, that St. Cyprian alloweth it, or thinketh well of it, ye shall find in the same epistle, that he utterly misliketh it, and condemneth it. For thus he saith: *Æquum est pariter et justum, ut uniuscujusque causa illic audiatur, ubi crimen admissum est:* “It is meet and right that every man’s cause be pleaded in that country, where the fault was committed,” &c. Again: *Oportet eos, quibus præsumus, non circumcursare:* “It is not meet, that they over whom we have jurisdiction, should run about the world:” he meaneth to Rome.

[Ib. p. 86.]

Cyprian in
eadem epist.
[p. 86.]

And again: *Nisi paucis desperatis et perditis minor videtur esse autoritas episcoporum in Africa constitutorum,*

⁵⁵ [After “cathedram” follow these words, “atque ad ecclesiam vol. ii. 298. (and also p. 147, note principalē.” See bishop Jewel’s ^{86.})]

&c.: "Unless a few desperate and wicked men think the authority of the bishops of Africa is less than the authority of the bishops of Rome." By these words St. Cyprian maketh the *bishop of Rome equal in authority with himself and other bishops*. Wherefore I must conclude with other words of St. Cyprian in the same epistle: *Hæc est, frater, vera dementia, non cogitare quod mendaciæ non diu fallant: noctem tam diu esse, quoad illucescat dies*: "O my brother, this indeed is very madness, not to think that lies cannot long deceive: the night lasteth no longer, but until the day begin to spring."

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 12. *Divis. 1 and 2.*

[Vol. iv. p.
48.]

Or, if there be no peril that harm may come to the *church*, what need is there to retain to no purpose the *names of bishops*? For so it is now commonly used among them. The names only they bear, and do nothing⁵⁶. For if there be no sheep that may stray, why be they called *shepherds*? If there be no *city* that may be betrayed, why be they called *watchmen*? If there be nothing that may run to ruin, why be they called *pillars*? Anon after the first creation of the world, the church of God began to spread abroad, and the same was instructed with the heavenly word, which God himself pronounced with his own mouth. It was also furnished with *divine ceremonies*. It was taught by the *Spirit of God*, by the patriarchs and prophets, and continued so even till the time that Christ shewed himself to us in the flesh. This notwithstanding, how often, O good God, in the mean while, and how horribly was the same church darkened and decayed⁵⁷!.....

Where was that church then, *when all flesh upon earth had defiled his own way*? Where was it, when

⁵⁶ [There is nothing corresponding to this sentence in the Latin.]

⁵⁷ [Here follows Harding's an-

swer to Division 1, which being nothing to the purpose, bishop Jewel omits.]

amongst the number of the whole *world*, there were only eight persons (and neither they all chaste and good neither) whom God's will was should be saved alive from that universal destruction and mortality?

1 Kings xix.
10.

when Elie the prophet so lamentably and bitterly [*al.* utterly, Lat. *acerbiter*] made his moan, that *only himself was left* of all the whole world, which did truly

Isa. i. 22. 21.
6.

and duly worship God? and when Esay said, "The *silver of God's people*" (that is, of the church) "*was become dross:*" and that the same *city which afore-time had been faithful was now become an harlot: and that in the same there was no part sound throughout the whole body, from the head to the foot?* or else,

Matt. xxi. 13.

when Christ himself said, that *the house of God was made by the Pharisees and priests a den of thieves?*

Of a truth, the church, even as a corn-field, except it be eared⁵⁶, manured, tilled, and trimmed, will, instead of wheat, bring forth thistles, darnel, and nettles. For this cause did God send ever among⁵⁷ both *prophets*, and *apostles*, and last of all his *own Son*, who might bring home the people into the right way, and repair anew the tottering church after she had erred.

M. HARDING.

These and the like places have been already alleged of old time against the catholics, by the Donatists, as St. Augustine sheweth; and of late years by your schoolmaster John Calvin of Geneva. We need not to study for new answers to the argument made out of these and such other places, much fitter for this purpose than these are, sith that the same is so well answered by St. Augustine. " Oftentimes" (saith he) " God's word re-

De Unitate
Eccles. cap.
12.

⁵⁶ [eared=ploughed.]

⁵⁷ [The adverbial use of this word is very rare.]

⁵⁸ [St. Augustine's words, as quoted by Harding, are here cut short by Jewel.]

Psalm ii. 8.

number? And what if the synagogue were sometime quite extinguished? Must it therefore follow, that the church also, after that God hath given to Christ his Son the ends of the world to be his possession, may now be brought to a few, and to fail all together?.....“Where was the church” (say ye) “when of all the world there were but eight persons, and they only saved alive from the universal destruction? Forsooth they were in Noe’s ark. And now have we ^a our Noe’s ark also, in which whoso-

a But the same ark is not the church of Rome.

ever abideth not, the same is drowned..... Neither were the prophets and apostles sent, nor Christ came himself, to repair anew the church, which had in faith wholly erred; but both they were sent, and he came, that it should not wholly err.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

It is true that ye say: “In the holy scriptures this word (all) is often used instead of many. And thus” (ye say) “it fared with the synagogue of the Jews; for that then the faithful were sometimes brought unto a small number: sometimes were utterly decayed, and consumed to nought. And in this sense” (ye say) “Elias complained, that the prophets of God were all slain, and he only left alive.” ^{1 Kings xix. 10.}

“But now” (ye say) “the church may not be brought to a few. For God hath given to Christ his Son the ends of the world to be his possession.” Yet Christ himself, M. Harding, that best knew the reach and limits of his possession, saith thus: “When the *Son of man* shall come, think you he shall find faith in the world?” Whereupon ^{Luke xviii. 8.} St. Ambrose saith: *Tunc fides rara: ut ipse quasi addubitans Dominus ista dixerit*: “Then shall faith be geason ^{Ambros. in Luc. lib. 10. cap. 21. [1. 1568.]} ⁵⁹ so that our Lord spake these words as doubting thereof, whether there should be any faithful left or no.” And St. John in his Revelations saith: *Mulier fugit in solitudinem, ubi habet locum paratum a Deo*: “The woman” (whereby is meant, not the *synagogue* of the Jews, but the *church* of Christ) “fleeth into the wilderness, where she hath a place provided of God.” By which words is meant, that in time of *ignorance* and *persecution* the *church* is without countenance, and unknown. St. Paul saith: “Before the day of the Lord there shall be a departing ^{2 Thess. ii. 3.} from the faith of Christ.” By these it appeareth, that the

⁵⁹ [Geasone=stunted, shrunk. Jamieson, Dict. Suppl.]

decay of the church shall be universal: and that the remainents shall not be many. Therefore Vincentius Lirinensis putteth the case on this wise: *Quid si novella aliqua contagio jam non portiunculam tantum, sed totam pariter ecclesiam commaculare conetur? Tunc item providebit, ut antiquitati inhæreat*: “What if some new corruption go about to invade, not only some portion of the church, but also the whole universal church altogether? Then must a Christian man settle himself to cleave to antiquity:” that is to say, to follow the primitive church of the apostles and ancient fathers. This case would he never have moved, unless he had thought the whole *universal church* might happen by some error to be deceived [*al. corrupted*]. Surely St. Chrysostom, speaking of the state of the *church* that he saw in his time, saith thus: *Videtur ecclesia hodie mulieri, quæ mansuetudine veteri exciderit, similis: quæque symbola tantum felicitatis illius quædam referat: arcas et scrinia rerum pretiosissimarum adhuc retinens, thesauro destituta. Huic mulieri ecclesia hodie videtur similis*: “The church this day is like unto a woman that hath quite lost all her old modesty: and that beareth only certain badges and tokens of her former felicity: and that, being utterly bereft of the treasures, keepeth only the cases and boxes of the precious things she had before. *To such a woman the church this day may be likened.*”

Vincentius
Lirinensis.
[cap. 4.]

Chrysost. in
in 1 ad Co-
rinth. hom.
36. [x. 339.]

Hieron. in
vita Malchi.
[iv. pt. 2. p.
91.]

Chrysost. ad
populum An-
tioch. hom.
4.

Likewise St. Hierom, speaking of that he saw by experience in his time, saith thus: (*Ecclesia*), *postquam ad Christianos principes pervenit* [leg. *venerit*], *potentia quidem et divitiis major, sed virtutibus minor facta est*: “The church, after that she is come to Christian princes, indeed is greater in wealth and riches: but in virtue and holiness she is less than she was before.” Therefore saith Chrysostom: *Hæc dico, ne quis miretur ecclesiam propter multitudinem: sed ut ipsam probatam reddere studeamus*: “Thus much I tell you, not that we should advance the church because of the multitude and increase of people; but that we should endeavour to adorn her with virtue.”

Now where ye say, *the church now can never be brought to few*, St. Bernard saith thus unto God by way of moan:

Conjurasse videtur contra te universitas populi Christiani, a minimo usque ad maximum: a planta pedis usque ad verticem non est sanitas ulla. Egressa est iniquitas a senioribus iudicibus, vicariis tuis, qui videntur regere populum tuum: "O Lord, the universal company of Christian people seemeth to have conspired against thee, from the lowest unto the highest. From the sole of the foot unto the crown of the head, there is no whole place. Iniquity and wickedness is gone forth from thy elder judges, that be thy vicars, that are thought to rule thy people."

Bernard. in
Conversione
Pauli, ser. 1.
[iii. 962.]

Again he saith: *Intestinalis et insanabilis est plaga ecclesiae*: "The wound of the church is inward, and past recovery." Likewise Baptista Mantuan complaineth unto pope Leo:

Citatur ab
Holcoto in
Sapient. lect.
23. [leg. 24.
p. 87.]

Bapt. Man-
tuan. Pastor.
4. [lin. 173.]

*SANCTE PATER SUCCURRE LEO, RESPUBLICA CHRISTI
LABITUR: ÆGROTATQUE FIDES JAM PROXIMA MORTI.*

"Help, holy father Leo: Christ's commonwealth" (that is, the church) "is falling down: the faith is sick, and like to die."

So likewise saith he that wrote the Fort of Faith: *Etsi in hoc dæmonum bello cadant religiosi principes, et milites, et prælati ecclesiastici, et subditi, . . . tamen semper manent aliqui in quibus salvatur veritas fidei, et justificatio bonæ conscientie: et si non nisi duo homines fideles remanerent in mundo, in eis salvaretur ecclesia, quæ est unitas fidelium*: "In this battle of devils, notwithstanding the godly princes, the soldiers, the ecclesiastical prelates, and subjects be overthrown, yet evermore some remain, in whom the truth of faith, and the righteousness of a good conscience is preserved. And although there remained but two faithful men in the world, yet in the same two the church of God should be saved: which church is the unity of the faithful." The church of God is often compared to the moon, which some-

Fortalium
Fidei, lib. 5.
[fol. ccclxi.]

Aug. Epist.
48.

Aug. in Psal.
cxviii. [iv.
1448.]

latus est ab iniquis: "Sometime the church was in *only Abel*: and he was destroyed by his brother *wicked Cain*. Sometime the church was *only in Enoch*: and he was translated from the wicked." Your own Panormitane saith:

Extra de E-
lectione, Sig-
nificasti, Abb.
[Panorm.
tom. 1. pt. 1.
fol. 122. col.
1.]

Possibile est, quod vera fides Christi remaneret in uno solo: atque ita verum est dicere, quod fides non deficit [al. deficit] in ecclesia.....Hoc patuit post passionem Christi. Nam fides remansit tantum in beata Virgine. Quia omnes alii scandalizati sunt: tamen Christus ante passionem oraverat pro Petro, ut non deficeret fides sua. Ergo (ecclesia) non dicitur deficere, nec etiam errare, si remanet vera fides in uno solo: "It is possible the true faith of Christ may remain in *one alone*: and so it is true to say, that faith faileth not in the church. This thing appeared after Christ's passion. For then the faith remained only in the blessed Virgin. For all the rest (both the apostles and others) were offended. Yet had Christ prayed for Peter before his passion, that his faith should not fail. *Therefore we may not say, the church faileth, or erreth, if the faith remain but in one alone.*" Again St. Augustine saith: *Non tamen propter hos remanebit Christus sine hæreditate. Novit Dominus, qui sint sui, &c.*: "Yet shall not Christ, because of the wicked, remain without his inheritance. *The Lord knoweth, who be his own.*"

Aug. in Psal.
lxxxviii. [iv.
p. 947.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 13. Divis. 1.

But lest some man should say, that the foresaid things happened only in the time of the law, of shadows, and of infancy, when the truth lay hid under figures and ceremonies, when nothing as yet was brought to perfection, when the law was not graven in men's hearts, but in stone: (and yet were that but a foolish distinction: for even at those days there was the very same God that is now, the same Spirit, the same Christ, the same faith, the same doctrine, the same hope, the same inheritance, the same covenant, and the same efficacy and virtue of

[Vol. iv. p.
49.]

God's word: Eusebius also saith: "*All the faithful, even from Adam until Christ, were indeed very Christians*⁵⁹," (though they were not so termed:) but, as I said, lest men should thus say still, *Paul the apostle* found the like faults and falls even then in the prime and chief of the gospel, in the greatest perfection, and in the light; so that he was compelled to write in this sort to the Galatians, whom he had well before instructed: "*I fear me,*" quoth [*al.* [Gal. iv. 11.] quod] he, "*lest I have laboured amongst you to small purpose, and lest ye have heard the gospel in vain. O* [*lb.* ver. 19.] *my little children, of whom I travail anew, till Christ be fashioned again in you.*" And as for the church of the *Corinthians*, how foully it was defiled, it is nothing needful to rehearse. Now tell me, might the churches of the *Galatians* and *Corinthians* go amiss, and the church of *Rome* alone may it not fail, nor go amiss?

M. HARDING.

.....We answer, that in parts of the church faults may be found, and sundry men that seem to be of the church, and be in the church indeed, may fall and perish: all this we grant. ^a But ^a We speak not of the whole universal church, but only of the church of Rome. that the whole catholic and universal church, whose faith we profess, may err, fall and fail, that we deny utterly, which had been this defender's part to prove, else he talketh to no purpose. And where St. Paul rebuketh all the Galatians in general, as though all had forsaken their faith, he doth it after the wont of the prophets, both in that and other epistles, for the greater part's sake, reprehending all, though some deserve praise..... As for the *Corinthians*, though many among them were faulty, yet who considereth how he beginneth his epistle to them, shall find that he ^b acknowledged a church among them. For thus he writeth: "*Paul by vocation an apostle, &c. to the church of God which is at Corinth,*" &c. ^b But the same church this day is subject to the religion of Mahomet, and is no church.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

"That in any particular church faults may be found, that" (ye say) "ye will confess: but that the whole catholic

⁵⁹ [Euseb. H. E. lib. 1. cap. 4. *ὁνόματι προσειπὼν τις, οὐκ ἂν ἐκτὸς*
... *ἐργῶ Χριστιανούς εἰ καὶ μὴ βάλοι τῆς ἀληθείας.*]

universal church may err and fail, that" (you say) "ye deny utterly."

Notwithstanding, it is certain, that the *churches of Corinth*, and *Galatia*, and sundry others, are now, not in any particular portion, but thoroughly departed from the faith: and are now wholly subject to the Turk.

This therefore must needs be your meaning, that, albeit all other *particular churches* throughout the world happen to err, yet the *church of Rome*, that is to say, the *pope* and his *cardinals*, can never err. This lesson, I trow, ye learned of Petrus de Palude: for neither Christ nor any of his apostles ever taught it you. This worthy doctor

Petr. de Palud. de potest. Curator. art. 6.

saith thus: *Tota ecclesia Petri non potest a fide deficere. Omnes autem ecclesie apostolorum omnium possunt deficere a fide totaliter, indigentes ab ecclesia Petri confirmari:* "The whole church of Peter cannot wholly fail from the faith. But all the other churches of all the apostles may fail wholly from the faith, having need to be confirmed by the church of Peter⁵⁹." And to this end you yourself call

M. Harding, fol. 16, b.

the *Roman faith* the *catholic faith*, making no manner difference between either other, as if *Roman* and *catholic* were all one. And therefore pope Nicolas thus advanceth and thundereth out his own authority: *Non qualibet terrena sententia, sed illud verbum quo constructum est cælum, et terra, per quod denique omnia condita sunt elementa, Romanam fundavit ecclesiam:* "Not any worldly sentence, but the selfsame word whereby heaven and earth was made, and whereby all the elements were created, was it that *founded the church of Rome*." By which words he meaneth that the *Roman faith* shall stand as fast as the foundations of heaven and earth. Even so Peter assured his promise unto Christ. "Although" (said he) "all others deny thee, yet I alone will not deny thee."⁶⁰—No, though I should presently die with thee, yet I (only) will never deny thee." Nevertheless, when it came to trial, the same Peter denied him first.

Dist. 22. Omnes.

Matt. xxvi. 33.

⁵⁹ [The Editor has not found this work.]

⁶⁰ [St. Matt. xxvi. 33. "Though all men shall be offended because of thee, yet will I never be offended."]

Now, that the *church of Rome*, which you call the *catholic church*, may err, and be forsaken of God, it is evident by the plain words of St. Paul. For thus he writeth even unto the *church of Rome*: *Quod si aliqui ex ramis fracti sunt*, &c.: “If any of the boughs be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, art grafted into the natural olive, and made partaker of the root and of the fatness thereof, boast not thyself against the boughs. If thou boast,” (remember) “thou bearest not the root: but the root beareth thee. Thou wilt say, The boughs are broken off, that I might be grafted in. Well, they are broken off for their infidelity: but thou standest fast by faith. Be not high minded, but stand in awe: seeing God hath not spared the natural boughs, lest haply he spare not thee. See therefore the goodness and the sharpness of God: his sharpness towards them that are fallen away; but his goodness towards thee, if thou continue and remain in goodness. *Otherwise thou*” (being the *church of Rome*) “*shalt likewise be smitten off*.” Hereby it is plain, that the *church of Rome* may fail, and fall from God, no less than other like *churches*. For otherwise this advertisement of St. Paul had been in vain.

Therefore Hormisda, being himself the bishop of Rome, writeth thus: *Dilectissimi fratres, continuas preces ad Dominum fundamus, et.....jugi deprecatione poscamus, ut et institutione, et opere, illi, cujus esse membra cupimus, adhæreamus, nec unquam ab illa via, quæ Christus est, devio tramite declinemus: ne ab eo juste, quem impie reliquerimus, deseramus*: “My dearly beloved brethren, let us pray unto God, that both by profession and by order of life we may cleave to him, whose members we desire to be: and that by any crooked path we never turn from that way, which is *Christ*, lest we” (being the *church of Rome*) “*be justly forsaken of him, whom wickedly we have forsaken*.” Thus would not the *pope* himself have written in the behoof of the *church of Rome*, if he had thought the same *church* could never have erred.

To be short, Chrysostom saith: *Ecclesia, quocunque modo egerit contra voluntatem Christi, abjici digna est*. *Non*

Rom. xi. 17.

Aliiqui et tu excideris.

Hormisda pap. ad Episcopos Hispanie. [ap. Mansi viii. 431.]

Chrysostom. de variis locis, in Matt. hom. 20.

autem abjicitur propter longanimitatem Christi, nisi sola causa transgressionis: “The church, by what way soever she do against the will of Christ, is worthy to be given over. Yet through the patience of Christ she is never given over, but only for breaking his commandments.”

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 13. *Divis. 2.*

Surely Christ prophesied long before of his church, ^[Vol. iv. p. 49.] that the time should come, when *desolation* should stand in the holy place. And St. Paul saith, that ^{2 Thess. ii. 3.} *Antichrist* should once set up his own tabernacle and stately seat in the *temple of God*: and that the ^{2 Tim. iv. 3.} time should be, *when men should not away with wholesome doctrine, but be turned back unto fables and lies*, and that within the very church. Peter ^{2 Pet. ii. 1.} likewise telleth, how there should be *teachers of lies in the church of Christ*. Daniel the prophet, speaking of the latter times of *Antichrist*, “*Truth*,” saith he, “*in that season shall be thrown under foot, and trodden upon in the world.*” And Christ saith, The calamity and confusion of things shall be so exceeding great, *that even the chosen, if it were possible, shall be brought into error*: and that these things shall come to pass, not amongst the *Gentiles and Turks*, but even in the *holy place*, in the *temple of God*, in the *church*, and in the *company and fellowship* of those, which profess the *name of Christ*.

M. HARDING.

The prophecy of Daniel concerning the abomination of desolation, whereof Christ spake in the gospel, we think with the ^a best learned divines, that it is to be referred, not to the end of the world, nor to the driving away of the faith by Antichrist, as ye imagine, but to the consummation and final ending of the synagogue.

^a Untruth. For the best learned divines have thought otherwise, as it shall appear.

Touching that ye say of Antichrist, it maketh nothing against the catholics, against whose faith he prevaiileth not. Marry, many good men think that he hath already begun to set up his

tabernacle and stately seat in the hearts of many, which ought to be the temple of God, by his forerunners, Martin Luther, Zuinglius, Calvin, and you their scholars, with the rest of that wicked rabble.....Where ye add, "and that within the church," it is ^b more than ye found in St. Paul. But we understand your good will, though we find you without ever a good reason. And yet we grant ye came out from us, as St. John saith, but ye were not of us. For if ye had been of us, ye would have tarried with us. So may the saying of St. Peter be referred to you, and likewise that of Daniel which ye allege, though the words be not in Daniel. For your schoolmasters and you are a limb of Antichrist, and ye labour what ye can to overthrow and tread under foot the true faith of the church, and the catholic religion.....

^b Untruth.
For St. Paul
saith plainly,
"He shall sit
in the temple
of God,"
2 Thess. ii. 4.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

What needed you, M. Harding, to talk so much in the favour of *Antichrist*? or why should you be grieved to hear him called the *abomination of desolation*? St. Paul calleth *Antichrist* "the man of sin." Some say, "He shall be wholly possessed of the devil." Your own Hippolytus saith, "He shall be the devil himself." Yet have few men found themselves grieved with such sayings.

2 Thess. ii. 3.
Nicol. Lyra.
Hieron. ad
Algasiam.
[iv. 210.]
† Hippolyt.
Mar. [de An-
tichristo, p.
9.]

I know the words of Christ and of Daniel, by divers expositions, have been diversely applied. Yet may ye not well thus condemn all their judgments, that have applied the same to *Antichrist*. Origen, one of the most ancient fathers of the church, entreating of *Antichrist*, contrary to your exposition, saith thus: *Ipse est abominatio desolationis*: "*Antichrist* is the abomination of desolation."

Origen. in
Matt. tract.
26. [iii. 860.]

St. Chrysostom saith: *Hic Antichristus dicitur abominatio desolationis: quia multorum Christianorum animas facturum est desolatas a Deo*: "This *Antichrist* is called the *abomination of desolation*: for that he shall cause the souls of many Christians to be desolate, and forsaken of God." Gregorius Nazianzenus saith: *Antichristus veniet in desolatione mundi: est enim abominatio desolationis*: "Antichrist shall come in the desolation of the world: *βδέλυγμα γὰρ ἐστὶ τῆς ἐρημώσεως*." St. Hierom

Chrysost. in
Opere Im-
perfecto,
hom. 49. [vi.
App. 203.]

Gregor. Naz.
Significatio
in Ezechiel.
[i. 872. App.]
βδέλυγμα
γὰρ ἐστὶ
τῆς ἐρημώ-
σεως.

⁶⁰ [This Significatio in Ezechiel is spurious in the opinion of the Bened. Edd., and doubtful in that of Cave.]

Hieronym. in
Matt. cap. 24.
[iv. 115.]

saith: *Abominatio desolationis intelligi potest omne dogma perversum*: "By the *abomination of desolation* we may understand any manner perverse doctrine:" whereof no doubt in *Antichrist* shall want no store. And again, speaking namely of the *man of wickedness, the adversary of Christ, which is Antichrist*, that lifteth up himself above all that is called God, he saith: *Abominatio desolationum erit in templo usque ad consummationem temporis*: "The *abomination of desolation* shall stand in the church until the consummation or end of time ⁶¹."

Ambros. in
Luc. lib. 10.
cap. 21. [i.
1507.]

St. Ambrose saith: *Abominatio desolationis execrabilis adventus Antichristi est*: "The *abomination of desolation* is the cursed coming of *Antichrist*."

Hilar. in
Matt. canon.
25. [p. 729.]

St. Hilary, expounding these self-same words of Christ, "When ye shall see the *abomination of desolation* standing in the holy place," saith thus: *De Antichristi temporibus hæc loquutus est*: "Christ spake these words of the time of *Antichrist*." Likewise saith Theodoretus, writing

Theod. in
Daniel. cap.
12. [ed. lat.
1608. p. 552.
col. 2.]

upon the prophet Daniel: *Abominationem desolationis ipsum vocat Antichristum*. And besides others, the most ancient and most catholic fathers, likewise saith Eusebius

Euseb. E-
miss.

Emissenus in a special homily to this purpose. Now, M. Harding, whereas ye so certainly assure yourself, that these words of Christ may in no wise be taken of the confusion and horror that shall be at the end of the world, besides all these learned and godly fathers, I beseech you, consider the whole drift and circumstance of the place, and the words that Christ spake immediately before. The apostles

Matt. xxiv. 3.

demande him this question: "What is the token of thy coming" (to judgment), "and of the end of the world?" To this question Christ answereth in this wise: "Take heed, that no man deceive you. Many shall come in my name, and shall say, I am Christ: and shall deceive many. Ye shall hear of wars and talks of wars: but be not ye troubled. All these things must happen: *yet this is not the end*, &c. Many false prophets shall rise, and shall

⁶¹ [S. Hieron. ".... dogma "ecclesia, et se ostendere Deum, "perversum, quod cum viderimus "debemus fugere."] "stare in loco sancto, hoc est in

deceive many. Iniquity shall increase: charity shall wax cold. Whoso continueth unto the end, he shall be saved. And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations, *and then shall come the end.*" The next words that follow are these: "Therefore when ye shall see the *abomination of desolation* that was spoken of by Daniel," &c. Thus may ye see, M. Harding, by the very course and tenour of Christ's answer, that if the *judgment* be the *judgment*; if the *end* be the *end*; if the *world* be the *world*; then must these words needs have relation to the *end* of the *world*: whatsoever any of your best learned divines, of whom ye have hitherto named none, have taught or said to the contrary. Whereas we say, *Antichrist shall stand even within the church*; "That" (ye say) "we find not in St. Paul. Notwithstanding, our good will" (ye say) "ye understand: although ye find in us never a good reason." As for the goodness of our reasons, we will not strive. But whether St. Paul say, that *Antichrist shall stand in the church*, or no, let us be judged by St. Paul. His words be plain: *Adeo, ut in templo Dei sedeat, tanquam Deus*: "So that ^{2 Thess. ii. 4.} he will sit in the church of God, as if he were God." If the *church of God* be the *church*, then doth St. Paul say: *Antichrist shall sit within the church*. In like sense Christ saith: "*Antichrist shall sit in the holy place.*" By which ^{Matt. xxiv. 15.} words many of the best learned fathers have expounded the *church of God*. St. Augustine saith: *Non enim templum alicujus idoli, aut dæmonis, templum Dei apostolus diceret*: "For the temple of an idol, or of a devil, the apostle would never call the *temple of God*." And he addeth further: *Quidam putant rectius Latine dici, sicut in Græco est, non in templo Dei, sed in templum Dei sedeat:.....tanquam ipse sit templum Dei, quod est ecclesia*. ^{Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. 20, cap. 19. [vii. 597.]} *Sicut dicimus, sedet in amicum, id est, velut amicus*: "Some men think, we should better read it in Latin, as it is in the Greek, not 'he sitteth in the temple of God,' but 'he sitteth for, or as the temple of God:' as if he himself were the temple of God, which is the church. As we say, He sitteth for a friend, that is, He sitteth as a friend." Here

Antichrist
standing in
the church
of God.

2 Thess. ii. 4.

Matt. xxiv.
15.

Augustin. de
Civit. Dei, lib.
20, cap. 19.
[vii. 597.]

In eodem
cap. [ibid.]
2 Thess. ii. 4.
εἰς τὸν ναὸν
τοῦ Θεοῦ...
καθίσαι.

St. Augustine saith : “ *Antichrist* shall not only sit in the church, but also shall shew himself in outward appearance, as if he himself were the church itself.” Now, M. Harding, who this should be, I report me to your own doctors, of whom one hath written thus : *Papa quodammodo virtualiter est tota ecclesia*..... : “ The pope in a manner, by way of virtue or power, is the whole universal church ⁶⁰.” St. Hierom saith : *Antichristus stabit in loco sancto, id est, in ecclesia, et se ostendet, ut Deum* : “ *Antichrist* shall stand in the holy place, that is to say, in the church : and shall shew himself, as if he were God.” St. Chrysostom saith : *Incident in abominationem desolationis, quæ stat in sanctis ecclesiæ locis* : “ They shall fall into the abomination of desolation, that standeth in the holy places of the church.”

Hervæus de
polest. papæ.
liis præmis-
sis.

Hieron. in
cap. 24.
Matthæi.
[iv. 115.]

Chrysost. in
Opere Im-
perfect. hom.
49. [vi. App.
204.]

Hilarius con-
tra Auxen-
tium. [p.
1269.]

2 Thess. ii. 7.

Anselmus.

Chrysost. in
Opere Im-
perfect. hom.
49. [vi. App.
204.]

St. Hilary saith : *Unum moneo : Cavete Antichristum. Male enim vos parietum amor cepit : male ecclesiam Dei in tectis, ædificiisque veneramini. Anne ambiguum est, in iis Antichristum esse sessurum ?* “ One thing I rede you : Beware of *Antichrist*. For it is not well that ye should be thus in love with walls : it is not well that ye should honour the church in houses and buildings. *Is there any doubt but Antichrist shall sit in the same ?*” St. Paul saith : *Mysterium iniquitatis operatur* : “ (*Satan*) worketh the mystery of iniquity.” That is to say, he openeth not himself, but whatsoever he doth, he doth it in covert. Upon which words Anselmus saith : *Iniquitas eorum est mystica, id est pietatis nomine palliata* : “ The iniquity of them is *mystical*, that is to say, it is cloaked and covered with the name of godliness.”

Therefore St. Chrysostom saith : *Christiani, qui sunt in Christianitate, volentes accipere firmitatem fidei veræ, ad nullam rem fugiant, nisi ad scripturas, &c.* : “ The *Christians* that be in Christendom, willing to have the steadfastness of the true faith, let them flee to none other thing but only to the scriptures. Otherwise, if they look to any thing else, they shall be offended, and perish, not knowing

⁶⁰ [A copy of Hervæus is in the Lambeth library.]

which is the true church: and so shall they fall into the *abomination of desolation, that standeth in the holy places of the church.*"

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 14. *Divis. 1 and 2.*

[Vol. iv. p. 50.]

Albeit these same warnings alone may suffice a wise man, to take heed he do not suffer himself rashly to be deceived with the name of the church, and not to stay to make further inquisition thereof by God's word; yet beside all this, many fathers also, many learned and godly men, have often and carefully complained, how all these things have chanced in their lifetime. For even in the midst of that thick mist of darkness, God would yet there should be some, who, though they gave not a clear and bright light, yet should kindle, were it but some spark, which men being in the darkness might espy.

Hilarius, when things as yet were almost uncor-
rupt and in good case too: "*Ye are ill deceived,*" Contra Aux-
entium. [p. 1269.]
saith he, "*with the love of walls: ye do ill worship the church: in that ye worship it in houses and build-
ings, ye do ill bring in the name of peace under roofs. Is there any doubt but Antichrist will have his seat under the same? I rather reckon hills, woods, pools, marshes, prisons, and quavemires⁶¹ to be places of more safety: for in these the prophets either abiding of their accord, or forced thither by violence, did prophesy by the Spirit of God⁶²*".....

Gregory, as one which perceived and foresaw in
his mind the wrack of all things, wrote thus of *John* Gregor. lib. 4.
ad Mauri-
tium. ep. 32.
*bishop of Constantinople*⁶³, the first of all others that commanded himself to be called by this new name,

⁶¹ [Sic in orig. edd.]

⁶² [Here Harding makes an attempt to explain St. Hilary.]

⁶³ [Lat. Apol. "*ad Joannem*:" a reading, which gives occasion to Harding's observation below.]

The *universal bishop of Christ's whole church*: "If the church," saith he, "shall depend upon one man, it will soon fall down to the ground." Who is he that seeth not, how this is come to pass long sithence? For long ago hath the *bishop of Rome* willed to have the *whole church depend upon* himself alone. Wherefore it is no marvel, though it be clean fallen down long ago.

M. HARDING.

a Untruth.
For he writeth it often.
Read the answer.

Ye make a foul lie, sir defender, upon St. Gregory. The words you recite be your own, not his. Is it not enough to lie yourself, as you do very often, but that you father lies also upon the doctors? Thanks be to God, that so ye bewray the weakness of your cause. ^a Neither in any epistle to John bishop of Constantinople, as you say in your Apology, nor in any to Mauritius the emperor, as you have noted in the margent, writeth Gregory, ^a That if the church shall depend upon one man, the whole shall fall to ground. I see well, you would fain Gregory had so written. And if he had, yet your argument had been naught. For you take not the right minor, which should have been this, The church doth depend upon one man, if you would make your reason good, and after the rules of logic. For where your minor speaketh only of the pope's will, thereof your conclusion followeth not. Dispose your propositions in the form of a syllogism, and you shall espy your own feeble reason. And if you make that your minor, then grant you that which you deny.

The words whereof you gather this pretended saying of Gregory, as I suppose, be these: "If any man hath caught unto himself that name" (of universal bishop) "in that church" (of Constantinople), "then the whole church" (which God forbid) "fell from his state, when he that is called *universal* fell." Gregory understandeth by the name *universal bishop*, as himself declareth

b A manifest untruth without wit.

in many places, ^b such a one as is a bishop altogether and only, so as there be no other bishop besides him. Now if it were granted that the bishop of Constantinople were this one and only universal bishop, this inconvenience would follow, that with the fall of that universal bishop the universal church also fell. For where the church is, there be bishops, and where be bishops, there is the church: and a ^c bishop universal by Gregory is as much as all bishops. That this being granted, the whole church is fallen from the faith, thus he proveth: "For," saith he, "the bishops of Constantinople have fallen into the gulf of great and detestable heresies; as Nestorius, who thinking Christ to be two persons, and believing that God could not be made man,

c Untruth, more peevish than the former.

Epist. lib. 4.
ad Maurit.
ep. 32.

ran to a Jewish infidelity: and as Macedonius, who denied the Holy Ghost to be God. Wherefore if the bishop of Constantinople be the universal bishop, according to the sense aforesaid, then at the fall of him from the faith, as when those two before named fell, the church also falleth, as then by this reason, when they were bishops, it fell." Thus reasoneth St. Gregory in that epistle to Mauritius. But because to Gregory it seemeth very far from reason, and incredible, that the church should fall from the faith, and fail; therefore he inveigheth against John the bishop of Constantinople for challenging that name of universal bishop, and concludeth, that the ^d bishop of that see in any wise cannot so be.

But if the word Universal signify a sovereignty of charge and supremacy of government over the whole church, ^e which Christ committed to Peter, and in Peter to his successors the bishops of Rome, when he said, "Feed my sheep:" in this sense it is not impious, nor erroneous, nor contrary to the mind of St. Gregory, to call the successor of Peter, Christ's vicar in earth, The universal bishop, ^f that is to say, the highest of all, and having power over all other bishops, and bishop of the universal church. And as Christ gave to St. Peter and his successors, for the benefit of his church, a supreme authority and power, so for the same church's sake, for whose love he delivered himself to death, by petition made to his Father, he obtained for him and his successors the privilege of this supreme and most excellent grace, that their faith should never fail. In consideration of which singular privilege, obtained by Christ, and ^g granted to the see apostolic, and to none other, Gregory rebuketh John bishop of Constantinople so much, as one that presumptuously usurped that new name of universal bishop against the statutes of the gospel, and against the decrees of the canons.

To conclude, if either Gregory or any other man should say that the church dependeth upon one man, he might seem to say truth, meaning rightly, and that not alone, nor without good authority. For such a saying we find uttered by St. Jerome. "The safety of the church" (saith he) "dependeth upon the dignity of the highest priest, who if he have not authority peerless and above all other, there will be so many schisms in the church as there be priests." Which peerless authority above all other, as St. Hierom in that place doth attribute to ^h the bishop of every diocese directly, so consequently to Peter's successor, to whom it was said, "Feed my sheep." For by what reason in each diocese it behoveth one priest to be highest over other priests, by the same and in like proportion no less it behoveth, that in the whole church one bishop be highest over other bishops, I mean for avoiding schisms.

^d Untruth, fond and wilful. For St.

Gregory speaketh these words no more of the bishop of Constantinople than of the bishop of Rome.

^e Untruth. For Christ never gave out any such commission.

^f This same was it, that Gregory reproveth: for thus he writeth: *Cuncta Christi membra tibi conaris universalis appellatone supponere.* Greg. lib. 4. epist. 38. [il. 742.]

^g Untruth, utterly void of shame.

^h Here M. Harding re. cateth his error. For before he said, "These words belong only to the pope." [Supra vol. ii. p. 192.]

John xxi.

John xiv.
Luke xxi.

Contra Luciferian. [tom. iv. pt. 2. p. 295.]

John xxi.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

If ye had better looked on your books, M. Harding, ye would not have been so hasty in dealing *lies*. *We falsify* not that good father's words: but report them truly as we find them. For thus he writeth in sundry places of John the *bishop of Constantinople*, that first advanced himself above all his brethren, and required to be called the *universal bishop* of all the world: *Universa ecclesia a statu suo corruit, quando is, qui appellatur universalis, cadit*: "The whole universal church falleth from her state, when he falleth that is called the *universal bishop*." This is no lie, M. Harding; confer the places, and ye shall find the words as we report them. It standeth not, neither with your profession nor with your modesty, so uncourteously to use your tongue. We neither *lie* ourselves, nor father *lies* upon the doctors. God be thanked, his cause is such as may well be maintained without *lies*.

But, to put you further out of doubt, the sense of these words ye may find often uttered by St. Gregory in other places. Unto Anastasius the bishop of Antioch, he writeth thus: *Ut de honoris vestri injuria taceam, si unus episcopus vocatur universalis, universa ecclesia corruit, si unus universus cadit*: "To dissemble the injury done to your honour, if one bishop be called *universal*, then if that one universal bishop fall, the whole universal church goeth to ground." Again he saith in the same epistle: *Vos eandem causam nullam dicere non debetis. Quia si hanc æquanimiter portamus, universæ ecclesiæ fidem corrumpimus*: "Ye may not say, This is a matter of no importance. For if we patiently bear these things, we destroy the faith of the universal church." Again he saith: *In isto scelesto vocabulo consentire, nihil aliud est, quam fidem perdere*: "To consent unto this wicked name, is nothing else but to lose the faith." Again: *Flens dico: gemens denuntio: quia cum sacerdotalis ordo intus cecidit, foris diu stare non poterit*: "I speak it with tears: I tell it with sigh of heart. For, seeing the order of priesthood is fallen within, it cannot now stand long without⁶²." Again: *Diabolus.....*

Gregor. lib. 4.
epist. 76. [il.
749.]

Gregor. lib. 6.
epist. 188. [il.
873.]

Gregor. in
eandem epist.
[il. 873.]

Gregor. lib. 4.
epist. 83. [il.
747.]

Gregor. lib. 4.
epist. 99. [leg.
55. tom. ii. p.
788.]

Gregor. lib. 4.
epist. 80. [il.
773.]

⁶² [This was said in reference to a different subject.]

ita valide in quibusdam ecclesiæ necessariis membris dentes figit, ut nulli sit dubium, quin, nisi unanimiter, favente Domino, cunctorum provida pastorum turba concurrat, omne, quod absit, citius ovile dilaniet: “The devil so strongly fasteneth his teeth in the necessary members of the church, that unless by God’s grace the provident company of all bishops join together, there is no doubt but he will soon destroy the whole flock: which God forbid.” And again he compareth the *pride* of this name with the *pride* of *Antichrist*: and saith, that the one shall work the confusion of the church no less than the other. Thus he saith, *Nunquid non, cum se Antichristus veniens Deum dixerit, frivolum valde erit? Sed tamen nimis perniciosum. Si quantitatē vocis attendimus, duæ sunt syllabæ: si pondus iniquitatis, universa perniciēs:* “When *Antichrist* shall come, and call himself God, shall it not be a very trifle? Yet shall it be marvellous hurtful” (to the church). “If ye weigh the quantity of the word, it standeth in two syllables: if ye consider the weight of the wickedness, *it is an universal destruction.*” These are no *lies*, as it liketh you to call them, M. Harding; they are very plain words: it is the undoubted meaning of St. Gregory. And therefore he calleth this claim of *universal power* a *superstitious*, a *profane*, an *ungodly*, and a *wicked* title: a name of *hypocrisy*, and a name of *blasphemy*.

To avoid these authorities, being so pregnant and so clear, ye are fain to fancy sundry pretty shifts, such as neither John nor Gregory was ever able to understand.

First, ye say, this John the *bishop of Constantinople* meant by this title utterly to disgrace all bishops and patriarchs whatsoever: and to make himself the *only bishop* of all the world. It is a childish labour to seek a knot in a rush, and to imagine doubts where the case is clear. It is certain, that the *bishop of Constantinople* meant none other *universal authority*, than that now is claimed by the pope. Therefore it is thus noted in the book called *Chronicon Eusebii*: *Institutum fuit, ut Romana ecclesia caput esset ecclesiarum omnium: cum prius Constantinopolitana id usurpare tentasset:* “Order was taken, that the church

Gregor. lib. 6.
epist. 194.
[ut. 30. tom.
ii. 881.]
Deus.

Chronicon
Eusebii, ann.
607. [ed. Ba-
sil. A. D.
1536.]

Matthias [i.
Matthæus]
Palmerius.
[ibid.]
Sabellicus
Ennead. 8.
lib. 6.

of Rome should be the head of all churches: whereas before, the church of Constantinople had attempted to usurp the same." Which thing is also noted by Matthias⁶³ Palmerius of Florence, and that without any manner difference or change of words. Sabellicus saith: *Bonifacius III. egit ab initio administrationis suæ cum Phoca, ut Romana ecclesia esset omnium aliarum caput. Estque id ægre, nec sine multa contentione apostolicæ sedi datum. Græci, id ad se decus trahentes, ibi Christianæ pietatis arcem esse oportere aiebant, ubi et imperii*: "Pope Bonifacius the Third, at the first entry into his office, was an earnest suitor unto the emperor Phocas, that the church of Rome might be the head of all other churches. Which thing hardly and with great labour was granted to the apostolic see of Rome. The Grecians, drawing the same honour unto themselves, said, it was necessary the head of Christian religion should be there, whereas was the head of the empire, which was at Constantinople."

Thus it plainly appeareth, that the bishop of Constantinople and the bishop of Rome craved both for one thing. Which thing, being wicked in the one, cannot well be godly in the other."

Urspergensis
in Phoca.
[A. D. 604.]

Likewise writeth Urspergensis: "At the request and suit of pope Boniface, Phocas the emperor appointed the see of the apostolic church of Rome to be the head of all churches. For before that time the church of Constantinople wrote herself the first or chief of all others."

By these it may appear, M. Harding, it was great folly for you thus to cavil at the name. For the power and jurisdiction then claimed by the bishop of Constantinople, and afterward usurped by the bishops of Rome, was all one. Therefore St. Gregory saith to John the bishop of

Gregor. lib. 4.
epist. 82. [ad].
38. tom. ii.
742.]

Constantinople: *Tu quid Christo, universalis ecclesiæ capiti, in extremi judicii dicturus es examine, qui cuncta ejus*

⁶³ [The name of Palmerius of Florence was Matthæus; he was the continuator of Eusebii Chronicon, which ends A. D. 447. The passage quoted therefore is not from Eusebii Chronicon, but from

this continuation. Matthias Palmerius of Pisa continued the work from A. D. 1449. All these Chronicles were printed together at Basle 1536.]

membra tibimet conaris universalis appellatione supponere? "What answer wilt thou make, at the trial of the last judgment, unto Christ the head of the universal church, which thus, by the name of *universal bishop*, seekest to make all his members subject unto thee?" Even the selfsame *universal power* claimeth now the *bishop of Rome*: and seeketh to make all other bishops through the world, and the whole universal church of Christ, thrall and subject unto himself.

The *bishops of Constantinople* fell sometimes into heresies, and were deceived. But Christ hath prayed for Peter, that his faith should not fail. *Ergo*, say you, "The bishop of Rome can never possibly be deceived." O, M. Harding, let shame once force you to refrain these vanities. I doubt not but hereafter, in place convenient, I shall be able to shew, that there have been mo heretics placed in *St. Peter's chair*, even in the *see of Rome*, than you are able to find in any one see within Europe.

Verily, St. Gregory's reason, touching the danger and confusion of the church, weigheth no more against the *bishop of Constantinople* than against the *bishop of Rome*. For thus he saith: "If he that is called the *universal bishop* happen to err, then needs must the whole *universal church* fall together with him into error." And therefore if ye had perused the *council of Basil*, ye should have found this self-same reason alleged there, not against the *bishop of Constantinople*, but against the pride and arrogancy of the *bishop of Rome*. The words be these: *Alio-*
qui, errante pontifice, sicut sæpe contigit, et contingere
potest, tota erraret ecclesia: "Otherwise, whensoever the
 pope erreth, as he hath often erred, and may err again,
 the *whole church* should err with him." Thus wrote the
bishops, and by your own judgment *catholic bishops*, in the
council of Basil: yet had they not forgotten the prayer
 that Christ made for St. Peter.

And therefore Franciscus Zabarella, a notable canonist,
 and cardinal of the church of Rome, seeing the great enormities that grew hereof, saith thus: *Papæ faciunt quicquid*
libet etiam illicita: et sunt [al. sic] plusquam Deus. *Ex*

Concil. Basil.
 in Epist. Synodali. [xxix.
 249 d.]

Francis. Zabarell. [in
 Synt. Tractt.
 de imp. fol.
 243. col. 1. A.]
 Citatur ab il-
 lyrico, de
 Sectis.

hoc infiniti sequuti sunt errores. Quia papa occupavit omnia jura inferiorum ecclesiarum: ita ut inferiores prælati sint pro nihilo. Et, nisi Deus succurrat statui ecclesiæ, universalis ecclesia periclitatur: “The popes do now whatsoever they list to do, yea although it be unlawful, and are become more than God. Hereof have followed infinite errors. For the pope hath invaded and entered upon all the right of the inferior churches: *so that the inferior bishops may go for nought.* And unless God help the state of the church, *the universal church is in danger*⁶⁴.” Thus hitherto, M. Harding, ye have found no *lie*.

Now where ye would seem to say, Gregory so reproveth the *bishop of Constantinople*, that nevertheless he claimed the same title and *universal authority* to himself: may it therefore please you herein to stand to the judgment of St. Gregory himself, of whom, I reckon, ye do not doubt but he understood his own meaning. Doubtless, if ye had so diligently considered St. Gregory as ye bear us in hand, ye should have found, that, touching any his own right herein, he disclaimeth this title, and refuseth it utterly.

Gregor. lib. 4.
epist. 76. [ii.
748.]

For so he writeth to the emperor Mauritius: *Nunquid ego in hac re, piissime domine, propriam causam defendo?*

In eadem
epist. [ibid.]

“O my most gracious lord, do I herein quarrel for mine own right?” Again he saith: *Non mea causa, sed Dei est: non ego solus, sed tota turbatur ecclesia: quia piæ leges, quia venerandæ synodi, quia ipsa Domini nostri Jesu mandata, superbi, atque pompatici cujusdam sermonis inventione turbantur:* “It is God’s cause: it is not mine. Not I only am troubled therewith, but also the whole church. For the godly laws, the reverend synods, and the very commandments of our Lord Jesu are broken by the invention of a certain proud and pompous name.” Again:

In eadem.
[ib. p. 749.]
Gregor. lib. 4.
epist. 80. [al.
36. ii. 771.]

Nullus Romanorum pontificum hoc singularitatis nomen assumpsit:—nullus decessorum meorum hoc tam profano vocabulo uti consensit:.....nos hunc honorem nolumus oblatum recipere: “None of all the *bishops of Rome* ever took upon him this name of *singularity*, to be called the *universal bishop*: none of my predecessors ever consented to use

⁶⁴ [Supra vol. iv. p. 257. note ¹⁰.]

this ungodly style: we ourselves will not receive this honour, though it were offered." Thus it appeareth by the judgment of St. Gregory, that this *universal authority* is utterly unlawful, not only in other *bishops*, but also even in the *bishop of Rome*.

Touching the place of St. Hierom, I see ye are content to give over, and to recant your former error. For in your *first book* ye say, "These words are notable above others; and therefore might not be dissembled." And where St. Hierom saith, "*The safety of the church* hangeth of the dignity of the high priest," (meaning thereby every several bishop within his own limits,) ye thought it good thus to lard the same by a proper *parenthesis*, with certain other special stuff of your own provision: *He meaneth the pope, Peter's successor*: as if this *high priest*, of whom St. Hierom writeth, could be none other but the *bishop of Rome*. Now upon some better advice, and by way of *retractation*, ye say thus: "This peerless authority above all others St. Hierom doth attribute to the bishop of every diocese:" which indeed was the very meaning of St. Hierom. Certainly, if St. Hierom by these words meant only the *bishop of Rome*, as ye told us before, then he meant not the *particular bishop of every diocese*, as ye tell us now. Therefore ye must needs confess, that either now or before ye have sought means to beguile your reader. As for the *pope, Peter's successor*, St. Hierom meant no more of him than of any other bishop. If it shall likewise hereafter please you to call in other your like oversights, ye shall publish more truth, and encumber your reader with less error.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 14. *Divis. 3.*

[Vol. iv. p. 50.]

Bernard the abbot, above four hundred years past, writeth thus: "*Nothing is now sincere and pure amongst the clergy: wherefore it resteth, that the man of sin should be revealed.*" The same Bernard, in his treaty of the Conversion of St. Paul: "*It seemeth now,*" saith he, "*that persecution hath ceased: no, no, persecution seemeth but now to begin, and that*"

M. Harding,
fol. 80.
[Supra vol. ii.
p. 192.]

[Bernard, in
Serm. Qui
habitat. tom.
i. 845.]

[Bernard, de
Convers.
Paul. tom. i.
962.]

even from them which have chief preeminence in the church⁶⁵. Thy friends and neighbours, O God, have drawn near, and stood up against thee: from the sole of the foot to the crown of the head there is no part whole. Iniquity is proceeded from the elders, the judges, and deputies, which pretend to rule thy people.

We cannot say now, Look how the people is, so is the priest. For the people is not so ill as is the priest. Alas, alas, O Lord God, the self-same persons be the chief in persecuting thee, which seem to love the highest place, and bear most rule in thy church.” The same

[Bernard. in
Cantica, ser.
33. tom. i.
1397.]

Bernard again, upon the Canticles, writeth thus: “All they are thy friends; yet are they all thy foes: all thy kinsfolk; yet are they all thy adversaries. Being Christ’s servants, they serve Antichrist. Behold in my rest, my bitterness is most bitter⁶⁶.”

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 15. Divis. 1.

In libello de
idiomate lin-
guarum.

Roger Bacon also, a man of great fame, after he had in a vehement oration touched to the quick the woeful state of his own time: “These so many errors,” saith he, “require and look for Antichrist⁶⁷.” Gerson complaineth, that in his days all the substance and efficacy of sacred divinity was brought unto a glorious contention, and ostentation of wits, and very sophistry. The poor men called *pauperes a Lugduno*, men, as touching the manner of their life, not to be misliked, were wont boldly to affirm, that the *Romish church* (from whence alone all

[Vol. iv. p.
51.]

⁶⁵ [Bernard. “Sed . . . nun-
quam deest persecutio Christiano,
sed neque Christo. . . Heu, heu
Domine Deus, quia ipsi sunt in
persecutione tua primi, qui vi-
dentur in ecclesia tua primum
diligere, gerere principatum.”]

⁶⁶ [Harding’s answer, which is

here omitted, amounts to a denial that St. Bernard spoke one word against the bishop of Rome’s supreme authority, “and the catholic doctrine that ye impugn and we profess.”]

⁶⁷ [The Editor has not as yet found this treatise.]

counsel and order was then sought) was the very same *harlot of Babylon and rout of devils*, whereof is prophesied so plainly in the Apocalypse⁶⁸.

M. HARDING.

.....Now cometh me he in with a new band, which consisteth of tag and rag, and a weak company, God knoweth, they be to shew their faces against the catholic church, which (as the Holy Ghost speaketh by Solomon) is "terrible like an army of men set in battle ray.".....

First, friar Bacon, the conjuror and necromancer, as commonly they say of him, he is set in the foreward, a man of great fame forsooth⁶⁹.....

Then cometh in the good plain father Gerson, a writer in our grandfathers' time; he complaineth that friars and students gave themselves too much to the unprofitable subtilty of scholastical questions. What maketh this against the faith of the church?

After these, this defender placeth in an outwing the false brethren of Lyons, commonly called Waldenses, or *Pauperes de Lugduno*, notorious heretics, condemned of the church... ..These being detestable heretics, condemned of the church, we reckon not what they say, no more than what Luther saith, what Zuingleius, what Calvin, what these defenders themselves say, what Antichrist, what Satan saith. For the enemies of God's truth may not be admitted to give witness against the truth.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Of these last authorities, which ye call *tag and rag*, we never made any great account. Notwithstanding, both Johannes Gerson and Rogerus Bacon were notable and famous in their times, and in all respects comparable then with the best. *Plain father Gerson* (for by such words ye thought it best to quail his credit, being otherwise counted a subtil disputer, and a profound school doctor) *was chancellor of the university of Paris*: and for his wisdom and learning was thought worthy to be the director of all the bishops in the *council of Constance*, that is to say, all the bishops of the world. Such a *poor simple plain father* was *father Gerson*.

Rogerus Bacon, as it appeareth by his *book, De Idiomate*

⁶⁸ [Apol. Lat. "...esse mere-
" tricem illam Babylonicam, de
" qua tam perspicuæ extant præ-
" dictiones in Apocalypsi, et cæ-

" tum inferorum."]

⁶⁹ [Harding says, that he had
seen friar Bacon's works in MS.
but not printed.]

Linguarum, was able to judge of the *Latin*, *Greek*, and *Hebrew* tongues: and besides divers other *books*, writeth also sundry epistles unto *pope Clement*: wherein he much complaineth of the ruin and confusion of the *church*. Certainly the weakest of these both hath more weight and substance than either your *Amphilochius*, or your *Abdias*, or your *Hippolytus*, or your *Leontius*, or your *Anacletus*, or your *pope Clemens*, whom ye so often call the *apostles'* fellow.

Howbeit, there is no man so simple but may bear witness to the truth. *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Lactantius*, *Arnobius*, *Eusebius*, *St. Augustine*, and other holy fathers, thought it no prejudice to their cause to allege the witness of the *frantic Sybils*. *St. Paul* allegeth the authorities of the *heathen poets Aratus*, *Menander*, *Epimenides*, that never knew God. Christ thought it no scorn to receive witness at infants' mouths. No, he refused not the *devils*, when they bare witness with him, and said, "We know that thou art Christ the Son of the living God." *Pauperes a Lugduno*⁶⁸ found fault with the pride of the *pope*, with the lewd life of the *clergy*, with *purgatory*, with *holy water*, with *pardons*, and with other your like deceivings of the people.

Æneas Sylvius in Historia Boemica.
[p. 103. c.]

They translated the *Bible*, and prayed in their natural known mother tongue. These were their errors: therefore were they called *detestable heretics*: therefore were they condemned by your church of Rome. But God's name be blessed for ever; sithence that time the *pope's* painted power hath still abated, and these *poor detestable condemned heretics* have still increased.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 15. Divis. 2.

I know well enough the authority of these fore-^[Vol. iv. p. 51.]said persons will be but lightly regarded amongst these men. How then if I call forth those for witness, whom they themselves have used to honour? What if I say, that *Adrian the bishop of Rome* did

⁶⁸ [The *Pauperes a Lugduno*, took their rise at Lyons about the afterwards called *Waldenses*, &c. year 1160.]

frankly confess, that all these mischiefs brast⁶⁷ out [Platina.] first from the high *throne of the pope of Rome*?

M. HARDING.

Here have we a man of straw set up, whom this defender nameth Adrian bishop of Rome. He giveth him a waze of straw in his hand, that afar off seemeth to be a sore weapon, taken out of the armoury of Platina,^a as is pretended⁶⁸. But when ye come near, and behold what fellow this is, and confer with Platina touching his weapon, ye see it to be a feigned thing. For there is no such saying by Platina attributed to any of the^b six Adrians bishops of Rome,^b whose lives he writeth. And mo there were not. Therefore where you say, "WHAT IF I SAY THAT ADRIAN," &c., I answer thereto, that if you say so, you say a false lie.

^a A great folly. For Platina was dead threescore years before Adrian VI. was pope.
^b Untruth, vain and unadvised. For Platina writeth not one word of Adrian VI.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Touching this pretty fancy of a *man of clouts*, and a *waze of straw*, I see well, M. Harding, ye thought it good policy to clout up the matter, and to satisfy your reader with a *strawen answer*. The *straw* was in your eyes, M. Harding, and not in the man. Ye stood too far aloof: your eyes dazzled, and therefore ye knew not what ye saw. If ye had drawn near, ye should soon have found your own error. It was *no man of straw*, but *pope Adrian* the sixth and last that we speak of: unless ye think the *pope's holiness to be a man of straw*. For thus he pronounced at Norinberg in Germany, in the great assembly of the *empire*, by the mouth of Cheregatus, *his legate à Latere*: *A sacerdotibus iniquitatem populi dimanare: multis nunc annis graviter multisque modis peccatum esse Romæ: et inde a pontificio culmine malum hoc atque luem ad inferiores omnes ecclesiarum præfectos defluxisse*: thus *pope Adrian* bade his legate say: "That the iniquity of the people grew from the priest: and that now, for the space of many years, there have been great and grievous offences committed in Rome: and that all this plague and mischief hath flowed unto all the inferior rulers of the church, even from the high throne of the pope's holiness." This same

Johan. Steldan. lib. 4. an. 1523.

⁶⁷ ["Brast," obsolete for "burst."]

⁶⁸ [In the original edition of the Lat. Apol. the name of Platina was

placed in the margin. The fault therefore is Jewel's or the printer's, and not Harding's.]

story is also extant, printed at Cologne, in a book called

Fasciculus Rerum Sciendarum.
Fascicul. Re-
rum Scienda-
rum.

Thus therefore once again we say, M. Harding, that *pope Adrian VI.* frankly confessed, that all these mischiefs proceeded first even from the throne or seat of the *pope's holiness*: and saying the same, notwithstanding your uncivil speech, we say *no lie*.

And lest ye should think this *legate Cheregatus*, either of forgetfulness or of malice, did his errand otherwise than he had in commission, the like words have sithence been uttered in your own late *chapter at Trident*, by *Cornelius the bishop of Bitonto*. These they be: *Effecerunt tandem, ut pictas in fucum et hypocrisim*, &c.: "They have brought to pass, that godliness is turned into hypocrisy: and that the savour of life is turned into the savour of death. Would God they were not gone wholly with general consent from *religion to superstition*: from *faith to infidelity*: from *Christ to Antichrist*: from *God to Epicure*: saying with wicked heart and filthy mouth, There is no God. Neither hath there been this great while any pastor or pope that regarded these things. For they all" (both *pope* and others) "*sought their own: and not so much as one of them*" (neither *pope* nor cardinal) "*sought for the things that pertain to Jesus Christ.*"

Cornel. Bi-
tontinus in
Concil. Tri-
dent. [Crabb,
iii. 979.]

Therefore, M. Harding, ye may henceforth spare your unsavoury and bitter speeches. For in these reports there is *no lie*.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 15. Divis. 3.

Pighius acknowledgeth herein to be a fault, that many abuses are brought in, even into the very *mass*, which *mass* otherwise he would have seem to be a most reverend matter. Gerson saith, that through the number of most fond *ceremonies*, all the virtue of the *Holy Ghost*, which ought to have full operation in us, and all true godliness, is utterly quenched and dead. Whole Græcia and Asia complain, how the *bishops of Rome*, with the marts of their *purgatories* and *pardons*, have both tormented men's consciences, and picked their purses.

[Pighius de
Privata Mis-
sa, Controv.
Ratisp. sub
fin.]

[Vol. iv. p.
51.]

M. HARDING.

Indeed Pighius in his sixth controversy, speaking of private masses, denieth not but certain abuses be crept into that most holy and most healthful thing, for so he speaketh. And adding further, "We know" (saith he) "to what man and to what men it pertaineth the same to correct. And let each man acknowledge his own measure, and understand his duty. As who should say, It is not meet for every man to take upon him to amend any thing that is amiss about the mass?" For he meaneth not that the mass itself is erroneous, as full well there he declareth; but that men be faulty in abusing that most holy sacrifice. For many come to the altar unworthily. Many be present at it, that ought not to come within the church doors. Some priests be of so lewd lives, and of so unreverend behaviour at it, as it were better they abstained. Albeit, I think he meant rather such abuses as the learned fathers of the provincial council of Coulen would to be amended: to wit, certain peculiar offices of masses devised by men of late years, besides the ordinance of the ancient forefathers⁶⁹.

As for the other great troop ye bring with you out of Greece and Asia, first we require you to make them agree with yourselves, and with the catholic church, about the procession of the Holy Ghost, and then we shall answer both you and them concerning your grievous matter of purgatory and pardons. It is not our manner to take the sayings of heretics for good and sufficient authority.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Indeed, M. Harding, here ye hew over high. Ye take upon you to make us understand Pighius' meaning: and yet by your own confession it appeareth ye never knew yourself what he meant. Ye say: "He found fault with the unworthiness either of the priests or of the people," ye know not whether: "or with somewhat else noted in the late chapter of Cologne," ye know not what. Yet whatsoever it shall please you to imagine, ye think you have wrong, if we believe you not immediately upon your word. But Pighius himself, whose tale ye would so fain tell, saith, not as you would make him say, "Abuses have crept into the priest or people:" but plainly and simply he saith: "Errors have crept into the mass."

⁶⁹ [Harding says, that the abuses to which Pighius alluded were organs, &c.]

Extr. de Con-
cess. præ-
bendæ. Pro-
posuit. In
Glossa. [lib.
iii. tit. 8. c. 4.
A.]
Extr. de
translation.
Episcop.
Quanto in
Glos. [lib. i.
tit. 7. c. 3. E.]

Howbeit, "These errors," ye say, "whatsoever they be, no man may redress, but only the pope." And good cause why. For your doctors say: *Papa ex nihilo* [leg. *nullo*] *potest facere aliquid*: "The pope of nothing can make something." And whatsoever he do, no man may say unto him: *Domine, cur ita facis?* "Sir, why do you so?" And the very heart and root of all your divinity of Lovaine is this: "*Christ hath prayed for Peter: Ergo, The pope can never err.*" But if ye mean plainly, and if there be no dissimulation nor hypocrisy in your words, tell me, I beseech you, even as you desire to be believed, of all the errors that Pighius meant, for the space of these forty years what one error hath the pope redressed?

There is no plainness in this dealing, M. Harding. Your mind is not to seek redress, be the fault never so evident: but still to continue yourselves in credit, and the world in error.

Dist. 22.
Omnes.

"All the Christians of Græcia and Asia," (ye say) "be heretics: and therefore ye reckon not what they say." No doubt: for they say, *The pope is not the head of the church*, which thing whosoever denieth, saith pope Nicolas, *must needs be holden as an heretic*. Thomas Aquinas, for that good affection and reverence he bare towards the pope, saith thus: *Dicere papam non habere universalis ecclesiæ primatum, est error similis errori dicentium, Spiritum Sanctum a filio non procedere*: "To say that the pope hath not the primacy of the universal church, it is an error, like unto the error of them that" (maintain heresy touching the Holy Trinity, and) "say, *The Holy Ghost proceedeth not from the Son of God.*" Of your readiness herein Ludovicus Vives writeth thus: *Augustinum vetustas sua tuetur. Qui si revivisceret cum Paulo, certe ille contemptui esset rhetorculus, aut grammaticulus: Paulus vero vel insanire, vel hæreticus videretur*: "St. Augustine is safe now because of his age. But if he and Paul were alive again, he should be shaken off as a bad rhetorician, or a poor grammarian. But St. Paul should be taken either for a madman or for an heretic." We may say of this generation as St. Augustine said of certain in his time: *Quicquid amant, volunt*

Ludovic.
Vives in lib.
13. de Civit.
Del. cap. 24.
[tom. ii. 44.]

August. Con-
fess. lib. 10.
cap. 23. [1.
183.]

esse veritatem: “Whatsoever thing they fancy, be it what it may be, the same they will have to be the truth.” Now judge you, M. Harding, what *church* of yours is this, where as St. Paul *the apostle of Christ, if he were now alive, should go for an heretic.*” Vesputius, as I remember, after he had travelled far, and had seen the manners and religions of many countries, saith thus: *Græci implicati sunt multis erroribus*: “The Greeks are entangled with many errors:” but he addeth withal: *Favit Deus, ne et Latini multæ irrepererint stultitiæ*: “God grant there be not many follies entered also into the church of Rome.”

Surely the *Christian men* that be this day in Græcia and Asia utterly abhor the *pope*, with all the deformities of his *church*. The Greek emperor, Michael Palæologus, Paul. Æmil. [fol. ccxxviii.] *Pantaleon*, for that he had submitted himself to the *pope* in the late *council of Florence*, was therefore afterward abhorred and hated of his people while he lived; and being dead, was forbidden *Christian burial*. Isidorus, the archbishop of Kiovia in Russia, for that, being returned from the said *council*, he began for unity's sake to move the people to the like submission, was therefore deposed from his bishopric, and put to death. In such reverence the *churches* of Asia and Græcia have this day the *church of Rome*. Matth. a Michon in Novo Orbe. [lib. 2. c. 1. p. 517. ed. 1537.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 16. *Divis. 1.*

[Vol. iv. p. 52.]

As touching the tyranny of the bishops of Rome, and their barbarous Persian-like pride, to leave out others, whom perchance they reckon for enemies, because they freely and liberally find fault with their vices, the same men, which have led their life at Rome in the *holy city*, in the face of the most holy father, who also were able to see all their secrets, and at no time departed from the *catholic faith*; as, for example, Laurentius Valla, Marsilius Patavinus, Francis Petrarch, Hierome Savanorola, abbot Joachim, Baptist of Mantua, and, before all these, Bernard the abbot, have many a time and much

complained of it, giving the world also sometime to understand, that the bishop of Rome himself (by your leave) is very *Antichrist*. Whether they spake it truly or falsely, let that go. Sure I am they spake it plainly. Neither can any man allege, that those authors were Luther's or Zuinglius' scholars: for they lived not only certain years, but also certain ages ere ever Luther or Zuinglius' names were heard of⁷⁰.

M. HARDING.

If this defender were compared to a mad dog, some perhaps would think it rude, and an unmannerly comparison. Let the man be as he is, whosoever he be: verily the manner and fashion of both is like, howsoever I be content his person be honoured with the due regard of a man. For as the mad dog runneth up and down, here and there, and now biteth one thing, and then another, snappeth at man and beast, and resteth not in one place: so this defender, to deface the church, sheweth himself to have a very unquiet head. Now he runneth at the bishop of Rome, then at the whole clergy. Now he barketh at errors in doctrine, and sheweth none; then he snappeth [*orig.* snappereth] at manners, and backbiteth men's lives. Now he bringeth forth scriptures, and them he stretcheth and racketh, but they reach not home. Then cometh he to the doctors, and maketh them of his side, whether they will or no. From doctors he runneth to conjurors, to rhyming poets, and to heretics themselves. I think they had rather run to the Turks, than the catholic faith should be received. And here leaving that he took in hand to prove, that the church erreth in necessary doctrine, he flingeth at the tyranny and pride of the bishops of Rome, and bringeth in for witness against them white and black, good and bad. So he hurt them, he careth not how, by what means, ne by what persons.

First, to get credit he uttereth a manifest lie, saying of them all, they led their life at Rome in the holy city under the nose of the most holy father, and might see all his secrets, and never forsook the catholic faith. His witnesses be these: Laurentius Valla, Marsilius of Padua, Francis Petrarch, Hierome Savanorola, Joachim Abbat, Baptist of Mantua, and St. Bernard, whom of spite he calleth Bernard the abbot. Now let us see how many

⁷⁰ [In the translation as printed in the text, the following sentence (cited by Harding) is left out: "Videbant illi etiam tum errores irrepsisse in ecclesiam, eosque cupiebant emendatos."]

lies here be made at once. Whereas of all these ^a never a one ^a Untruth. For Mantuan dwelt in Rome: Petrarcha was made poet in Rome: Savanorola was often in Rome, &c. led his life at Rome, but Laurence Valla, who was a canon of Lateran, and this defender saith that all did; there is one lie. That all these might see the pope's secrets, there be two lies. That none of these forsook the catholic faith, ^b there be three lies. As for Laurence Valla, he was not in every point very sound, as it appeareth in his book of Free Will, and in his Annotations upon the New Testament. In all things he handled he shewed himself new-fangled, rather than groundedly learned, as well in grammar and logic, as in divinity.

But Marsilius of Padua, to please the emperor Ludovicus Bavarus, who lived above two hundred years past, through malice conceived against pope John XXII., of whom the said Ludovicus was for just causes excommunicate⁷¹, went so far in schism, ^c as at length he fell into heresy. And abbot Joachim, whiles he reproved Peter Lombard, ^d uttered heresy contrary to the catholic faith, touching the Trinity: and therefore his book was condemned by the church, though his person was not condemned, because he submitted himself and his writings to the judgment of the holy Roman church, as we find in the Decretals. That all these have greatly and often complained of the bishops of Rome their tyranny and pride, ^e there be four lies. That they declared the pope himself to be very Antichrist, ^f there be five lies. And whereas to make this shameless lie you ask leave, so we ask leave of you to tell it you, and to challenge you of a lie, and say plainly unto you, that speaking of them all, you belie them, and that you shall never be able to prove that you say of them.

Francis Petrarch the Italian poet, and Baptist of Mantua the Latin poet, speak like poets, each of them once in their works against the evil manners of the court of Rome. But what proof maketh all this that the Roman church, that is to say, the west church, which only remaineth, and ever hath remained whole and sound of faith, erreth in doctrine? or what argument can you gather out of all these, I will not say against the life, but against the office, authority, and dignity of the bishop of Rome? The argument you can make hereupon is this: Poets reprehend the vices of the court of Rome: *ergo*, the pope is Antichrist: or, *ergo*, the catholic church erreth, and is to be forsaken. What force is in this reason, every reasonable man, be he never so mean of wit, may soon judge.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Your comparison of *mad dogs*, M. Harding, becometh well the rest of your courteous eloquence. Whoso shall mark how vainly you *snap* at whatsoever ye can imagine

⁷¹ [The cause of his excommunication was his assertion of the emperor's superiority over the pope.]

is in your way: now at our *logic*: now at our *rhetoric*: now at our *Greek*: now at our *Latin*: now at our *lame-ness*: now at our *lean cheeks*: now at our *thin beards*: now at our *superintendentships*: now at our *ministerships*: now at our *masterships*: now at our *maships*: (for this is the sobriety and gravity of your speech:) and further, how greedily and eagerly ye fasten your teeth, and feed yourself with wind, and are still *snapping*, and catch nothing: although in regard of manhood he spare to call you a *mad dog*, as it liketh you to call others, yet he may well think you scarcely to be a sober man.

Christ found fault sometime with the *bishops*: sometime with the *priests*: sometime with the *scribes*: sometime with the *pharisees*: sometime with the *people*: sometime with their *religion*: sometime with their *traditions*: sometime with their *ignorance*: sometime with their *prayers*: sometime with their *fastings*: sometime with their *life*: sometime with their *hypocrisy*: sometime with their *cru-elly*: and thus, in your fantasy, *he ran hither and thither, up and down*. Yet, I trow, ye will not touch him with your comparisons, nor say therefore as ye say to us, “*He had a very unquiet head.*”

Whoso hath eyes to see, and considereth the miserable *abuses of the church of Rome*, touching either *life* or *religion*, cannot lightly want just matter to reprove. Ye remember what church it is, whereof St. Bernard saith, *A planta pedis usque ad verticem capitis, non est sanitas ulla: non est jam dicere, Ut populus, sic sacerdos: quia nec sic populus, ut sacerdos*: “There is not one whole place from the sole of the foot to the top of the head. We may not now say, As is the people, so is the priest: for the people is nothing so ill as is the priest.”

Ye say: “These witnesses dwelt not in Rome.” And here in a small matter ye have noted a great *lie*. Howbeit, Bernard the abbot, that dwelt furthest off, was twice in Rome, and was chief of council with pope Innocentius in his greatest affairs. Franciscus Petrarcha *was made poet in the capitol*, and kept Laura his *concubine*⁷¹ in the eye of

Bernardus in
Conversione
Pauli, serm.
1. [tom. i.
962.]

Guillem. Abb.
in Vita Ber-
nardi.
Raphel. Vo-
laterran. [lib.
21.]

⁷¹ [Volaterranus says nothing about his keeping Laura.]

the pope, and had his most abode in Rome. Laurentius Valla was *canon* of the cathedral church in Lateran, and lead his life, and died in Rome. Briefly, St. Bernard only excepted, all the rest were Italians, and dwelt never far from Rome: and, as it may appear by the plainness of their speech, understood some part of the deepest secrets of the *church of Rome*.

Marsilius Patavinus, ye say, *was an heretic*. But what one *heresy* he defended, or before what judge he was convicted, or where he was either abjured or punished for the same, neither you nor any of all your fellows have hitherto told us. Therefore we must think *he was an heretic without heresy, as some men be doctors without divinity*.

Joachim Abbas found fault with the *bishop of Rome*, and therefore he must needs be an *heretic*. As for that he is charged in the *pope's Decretals* with error touching the *Trinity*, it is a great untruth, as ye may clearly perceive by a book that Martin Luther hath purposely written in his defence.

Certainly Laonicus Chalcocondyla, a Greek writer, giveth unto this Joachim a very worthy commendation. For thus he saith of him: *De pontificibus, Joachim abbas*, &c.: "Joachim the abbot, regarded among the learned in Italy as a man of a singular gift in prophecy, foretold many things of the popes, how they should come to the popedom, and how they should live. And as he spake, even so it came to pass. As touching his knowledge, he seemed to be a heavenly man."

But to come near the matter, and to speak of the thing that most misliketh you, St. John saith: "*Antichrist* shall sit in a city built upon seven hills:" (and so is the *city of Rome*.) Irenæus saith: "The number of *Antichrist's* name shall be expressed by this word *Latinus*⁷²," whereby it is likely is meant the bishop of Rome. Sibylla saith: "The greatest terror and fury of his empire, and the greatest woe that he shall work, shall be by the banks of Tiber." And there is Rome. These circumstances seem plainly to

Marsilius Patavinus.

Joachim. Abb. Extr. de summa Trin. et Fide Catholicæ. Damnamus. [lib. 1. tit. 1. c. 2.]

Laonic. Chalcocondyla, lib. 6. [p. 160.]

Plane Divinitus. [p. 161.]

Rev. xvii. 9. Virg. Sep. temque una sibi muro circumdabit arcem.

Iren. lib. 5. c. ult. [p. 329.] Sibylla Oratione 8.

Λυγρὰς παρὰ θύβριδος ὕχθαις.

⁷² [Supra, vol. v. p. 458, note ⁴⁷.]

Hieron. ad
Algasiam.
[iv. 209.]

paint out the *city of Rome*. St. Hierom saith: *Antichristus sedebit in templo Dei, vel Hierosolymis, ut quidam putant, vel in ecclesia, ut verius arbitramur*: “*Antichrist shall sit in the temple of God, either at Jerusalem, as some think, or else in the church*” (of God) “*itself, which we take to be the truer meaning.*” St. Gregory saith: *Ego fidenter dico, quod quisquis se universalem sacerdotem vocat, vel vocari desiderat, in elatione sua Antichristum præcurrit*: “I speak it boldly, Whosoever calleth himself the *universal priest*, or desireth so to be called” (as doth the pope) “in the pride of his heart, he is the *forerunner of Antichrist.*”

Gregor. lib. 6.
epist. 30. [ii.
881.]

And when John, *then bishop of Constantinople*, had first entered his claim unto this title, St. Gregory made answer unto the same: *Ex hac ejus superbia quid aliud, nisi propinqua jam esse Antichristi tempora designatur?* “By this pride of his, what thing else is signified, but that the time of *Antichrist* is even at hand?”

Gregor. lib. 4.
epist. 34. [i.
751.]

Again he saith upon occasion of the same: *Rex superbiæ prope est, et, quod dici nefas est, sacerdotum est* [leg. ei] *præparatus* [al. *præparatur*] *exercitus*: “The king of pride” (that is, *Antichrist*) “is coming to us, and an army of priests is prepared, which thing is wicked to be spoken.”

Hieron. ad
Algasiam. [iv.
209.]

St. Hierom saith: *Antichristus omnem religionem suæ subiciet potestati*: “*Antichrist shall cause all religion to be subject to his power*”⁷³.

2 Thess. ii. 7.

I will not here take upon me to descry either the person or the dwelling-place of *Antichrist*. Whoso hath eyes to see, let him see. These circumstances agree not unto many. St. Paul saith: “*Antichrist worketh the mystery or secret practice of iniquity.*” Whereupon the Gloss saith: *Mystica est impietas Antichristi, id est, pietatis nomine palliata*: “The wickedness of *Antichrist* is mystical, that is to say,” (it is not plain, and open, or easy to be espied of every body, but) “cloked under the name of godliness.” And your Gloss upon St. Paul unto Timothy saith thus: *Habentes speciem pietatis, id est, Christianæ*

2 Tim. iii. 5.

⁷³ [S. Hieron. . . . “Sive probatam omnem et veram religionem suo
“ calcet pede.”]

religionis: "Having a show of godliness, that is to say, a show of the religion of Christ." So mystical shall *Antichrist* be in all his dealing. And forasmuch as M. Harding thinketh we misallege these writers, and violently force them to our side, whether they will or no, St. Bernard saith thus: *Bestia illa de Apocalypsi, cui datum est os loquens blasphemias, et bellum gerere cum sanctis, Petri cathedram occupat, tanquam Leo paratus ad prædam*: Bernar. epist. 125. p. 1316. [ed. Bened. tom. i. col. 130.]

"The beast that is spoken of in the *book of Revelations*, unto which beast is given a mouth to speak blasphemies, and to keep war against the saints of God, *is now gotten into Peter's chair*, as a lion prepared to his prey⁷⁴." Behold, M. Harding, St. Bernard telleth you, that *Antichrist is possessed in Peter's chair*. Howbeit ye may soon find a salve for this sore. For ye will say, Bernard wrote these words against Petrus Luna, [*al. de Leon*] an *intruder* and *usurper* of the see of Rome, and not against Innocentius VII. [*leg. II.*] that was pope indeed. This is true, M. Harding, and not denied, nor any way prejudicial to our purpose: for hereby ye may see, by Bernard's judgment, it is not impossible, but either by election, or by intrusion, by one way or by other, *Antichrist* may sit in *Peter's chair*. Mark well his words: thus he saith: *Bestia habens os loquens blasphemias, occupat cathedram Petri*. But if you, M. Harding, or any other your friends, shall hope to start out at this poor hole, what will you then say unto Arnulphus, that saith, "The very pope himself, notwithstanding any his canonical election, if he want charity, is *Antichrist*, sitting in the *temple of God*?" What will you say to Bernard himself, that calleth the popes of his time *traitors, wolves, Pilates, devils*, and the *darkness* of the world? Tell your friends, M. Harding, that Bernard speaketh not these words of *intruders*. This shift will not serve. He speaketh them of *very popes* indeed, of *Christ's vicars*, of *Peter's successors*, and of the *heads* of

⁷⁴ [The pope to whom St. Bernard alludes was styled Anacletus, who, although elected by a majority of the cardinals, and enthroned, is considered an antipope, as well as his successor Victor II., who resigned.]

the church. Joachimus Abbas said above three hundred years sithence: *Antichristus jampridem natus est Romæ, et altius se extollet in sede apostolica*: “*Antichrist is already born in Rome, and shall advance himself higher in the apostolic see.*”

In Concilio
Remensi, in-
ter Opera
Bernardi.

Arnulphus, in the council of Rheims, saith thus: *Quid hunc, reverendi patres, in sublimi solio residentem, veste purpurea et aurea radiantem, quid hunc, inquam, esse censeatis? Nimirum, si charitate destituitur, solaque scientia inflatur, et extollitur, Antichristus est in templo Dei sedens, et sese ostendens, tanquam sit Deus*: “What think you, reverend fathers, of this man” (he meaneth the pope) “sitting on high in his throne, glittering in purple and cloth of gold? What think you him to be? Verily, if he be void of charity, and be blown up and advanced only with knowledge, then is he *Antichrist sitting in the temple of God*, and shewing out himself as if he were God?” The

Aventinus.
[p. 420.]

bishops in the council at Reinspurge say thus: *Hildebrandus papa sub specie religionis jecit fundamenta Antichristi*: “Pope Hildebrand, under a colour of holiness,” (by forbidding priests’ marriage) “hath laid the foundation for *Antichrist*.” Dantes, an Italian poet, by express words calleth Rome *the whore of Babylon*. Franciscus Petrarcha likewise saith: “*Rome is the whore of Babylon*, the mother of idolatry and fornication, the sanctuary of heresy, and the school of error.” I know these words will seem odious unto many. Therefore I will stay, and spare the rest.

Dantes in
Cantione 32.
Fran. Pe-
trarcha,
epist. 20.

Conc. Late-
ran. sub Ju-
lio et Leone,
sess. 11.
[Harduin ix.
1808.]

The pope himself, for that he saw to whose person and credit these things belonged, therefore in his late council of Lateran gave strait commandment to all preachers, that no man should dare once to speak of the coming of *Antichrist*.

Indeed many places of the holy scriptures, spoken of *Antichrist*, seemed in old times to be dark and doubtful, for that as then it appeared not unto what state and government they might be applied. But now, by the doctrine and practice of the church of Rome, to them that have eyes to see, they are as clear and as open as the sun.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 17. *Divis. 1.*[Vol. iv. p.
52.]

And what marvel if the church were then carried away with errors in that time, specially when neither the bishop of Rome, who then only ruled the roast, nor almost any other, either did his duty, or once understood what was his duty? For it is hard to be believed, whiles they were idle, and fast asleep, that the devil also all that while either fell asleep, or else continually lay idle. For how they were occupied in the mean time, and with what faithfulness they took care of God's house, though we hold our peace, yet, I pray you, let them hear Bernard their own friend. "*The bishops,*" (saith he,) "*who now have the charge of God's church, are not teachers, but deceivers: they are not feeders, but beguilers: they are not prelates, but Pilates.*" These words spake Bernard of that *bishop*, who named himself the highest *bishop* of all, and of the other *bishops* likewise, which then had the place of government. *Bernard was no Lutheran: Bernard was no heretic*: he had not forsaken the catholic church: yet nevertheless he did not let to call the *bishops* that then were *deceivers, beguilers, and Pilates*. Now when the people was openly deceived, and Christian men's eyes were craftily bleared, and *Pilate* sat in judgment place, and condemned *Christ* and *Christ's members* to sword and fire; O good Lord, in what case was *Christ's church* then? But yet tell me, of so many and so gross errors, what one error have these men at any time reformed? or, what fault have they once acknowledged and confessed?

[S. Bernard.
in Concil.
Rem. Mansi,
xxi. 472.]

M. HARDING.

The spirit of
modesty.

Why, sirs, are ye so well learned, and so holy of life yourselves, that ye take upon you to judge the bishop of Rome, Christ's chief officer in earth, and all other men, before the time of your apostates, and renegade friars, to have been both impious for not doing their duty, and ignorant for not knowing what was their duty? Was all virtue so far banished, all necessary knowledge and Christian learning so clean put out, that we must now begin to learn how to believe, and how to live a Christian life, of such light preachers, wicked vow-breakers, lewd lecherous lurdens, and detestable blasphemers, as your devilish rabble is?.....

a The pope is
Christ. This
is well to be
marked.

St. Bernard's words to Eugenius be these: *Age, indagemus adhuc diligentius quis sis*, &c. "Well, go to, let us somewhat more diligently examine what manner a man thou art, what person thou bearest for the present time in the church of God. Who art thou? The great priest, the highest bishop. Thou art the chief of all bishops, thou art the heir of the apostles: for primacy thou art Abel, for government Noe, for patriarchship Abraham, for holy order Melchisedech, for dignity Aaron, for authority Moses, for judgment Samuel, for power Peter, a for thy anointing Christ. Thou art he to whom the keys were delivered, to whom the sheep were committed. There be also other porters of heaven, and pastors of flocks. But thou so much far passing all other, as thou hast inherited both names much more indifferent. They have their flocks assigned unto them, each man one. All are committed to thee, the one whole flock to one. Neither art thou only the pastor of all the sheep, but also the only pastor of all the pastors.....

Lib. 2. de
Considerat.
[l. 428.]

"Wherefore, according to thine own canons, other are called into part of care, thou into fulness of power. The authority of others is restrained to certain prescript bounds: thine is extended even upon those who have received power over others. Canst not thou, if there be cause why, close up heaven gates against a bishop, deprive him of his bishopric, and give him up to the devil?.....

St. Peter
leapeth for
the pope-
dom.

"Now hear another reason, which confirmeth that prerogative to thee, as well as the other. The disciples rowed, and our Lord appeared unto them on the shore, and that in his body now again restored unto life, which was more comfortable unto them. Peter, knowing that it was our Lord, leapt into the sea, and so came unto him, and the rest came by boat. What meaneth this? Forsooth it was a sign of the singular popedom of Peter, by which he took into his government, not one only one ship, as the other did, each man his own, but the whole world".....

John xxi.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

“*Apostates, renegades, lecherous lurdains, detestable, devilish rabble?*” O, M. Harding, the vessel that held this liquor was not clean. We condemn not your *clergy*, either for life or for learning; but only report therein the judgment of others your special friends. And therefore if any thing mislike you herein, the fault is in them, and not in us. St. Bernard saith, Your *bishops* in his time were not *doctors*, but *deceivers*: not *feeders*, but *defrauders*: not *prelates*, but *Pilates*. Judge you now, in what case the church of God stood then, when the *bishops* that were the guides and leaders of the people might be compared to *Pilate*, that gave sentence in judgment against Christ.

Johannes Vitalis, *a cardinal of Rome*, and therefore in no wise of your part to be refused, saith thus: *De sacerdotibus modernis dicit Hieremias, Stupor et mirabilia facta sunt in terra. Prophetæ prædicabant mendacium: et sacerdotes applaudebant manibus, et populus meus dilexit talia*: “Concerning the priests that now be, Hieremy saith, Horror and wonders are wrought upon the earth. The prophets have preached lies: the priests have clapt their hands at it for joy, and liked it well: and my people have loved such things.”

Albertus Magnus saith: *Illi qui modo præsumunt in ecclesiis, plurimum sunt fures et latrones.....plus exactores, quam pastores: plus spoliatores, quam tutores: plus mactatores, quam custodes: plus perversores, quam doctores: plus seductores, quam ductores. Isti sunt nuntii Antichristi, subversores ovium Christi*: “They that now govern the church, for the most part, be thieves and murderers: more catchers than feeders: more spoilers than defenders: more killers than keepers: more deceivers than doctors: more beguilers than guiders. These be the *vauntcurrers of Antichrist*, the *subverters of the sheep of Christ*.”

William Holcote saith: *Sacerdotes moderni, sunt similes sacerdotibus Baal:.....sunt angeli apostatici:.....sunt similes sacerdotibus Dagon:.....sunt sacerdotes Priapi:.....*

Johan. Vitalis de prælatibus et sacerdotibus.
Jerem. v.

Albertus in Johan. cap. 10. E.E. [xl. p. 193.]

Guil. Holcote in lib. Sapientie, lectio 182. [l. 183. p. 604.]

sunt angeli abyssi: "The priests of this time are like the priests of Baal: they are the renegade angels: they are like the priests of Dagon: they are the priests of Priapus: they are the angels of hell." St. Bernard saith: *Dicimini pastores, cum sitis raptores. Fratres, Jesus hodie elegit sibi multos diabolos episcopos. Non sunt pastores, sed traditores*: "Ye are called bishops, but ye are raveners. O my brethren, Jesus at this time hath chosen unto him many devils to be bishops: they are not feeders: they are traitors." Johannes Sarisburiensis said boldly unto pope Adrian the Fourth: *Ideo mea opinione papæ frequentius moriuntur, ne totam corrumpant ecclesiam*: "Therefore in my judgment the popes die the oftener, lest" (if they should continue long) "they should infect the whole church."

Bernar. in
Concil. Re-
mensi. [xxi.
472.]

Johan. Sa-
risb. in Polyc.
lib. 6. c. 24.

Bernar. in
Cant. serm.
66. [iv. 1500.]

Again St. Bernard saith: *Pudeat successores apostolorum, lucem non esse mundi, sed modii: mundi autem tenebras. Dicamus eis, Vos estis tenebræ mundi*: "Let it shame the successors of the apostles not to be the light of the world, but the light of the bushel: and rather the darkness of the world. Let us therefore say unto them, *Ye are the darkness of the world.*"

Through these spectacles we may behold the state of the church of Rome. For Christ saith: "If the light itself that is in thee be made *darkness*, how great then will the *darkness* itself be!" How can the city be kept in safety, if the watchman be blind and see nothing? "If the blind lead the blind, both fall into the pit." Christ saith: *Dormientibus illis, creverunt zizania*: "While the husbandmen were asleep, then the cockle and darnel grew." St. Hilary saith: *Ecclesiæ, intra quas verbum non vigilat* [leg. *vigilaverit*], *naufragæ sunt*: "The churches wherein God's word watcheth not, suffer shipwreck and are drowned."

Hilar. in Mat-
thæ. canon.
8. [p. 644.]

Bernar. de
Considera-
tione ad Eu-
gen. lib. 2.
[cap. 8. ii.
428.]

But Bernard, ye say, *stoutly maintained the supremacy*. I grant you. Neither did we ever allege him to prove the contrary. He defendeth also other great and gross errors, as living in a time of deepest darkness. But the reasons he useth seem very weak, specially to win so great

a matter. For thus he saith: "*Peter leapt into the water* John xxi. and came to Christ:"

"*The rest of the disciples came by boat:*"

Ergo, *The pope hath the jurisdiction of all the world.*

Such other pretty reasons, made in the pope's behalf, ye may find many. Peter Crab, that lately compiled the *books of councils*, reasoneth thus: Concil. [ed. Crabb,] tom. i. p. 10.

Peter paid the tribute money for Christ and himself: Matt. xvii. 27.

Christ said unto Peter, "Follow thou me:" John xxi. 19.

Again he said, "Launch forth into the deep:" Luke xxii. 50.

Again, "Peter, art thou asleep? Couldst thou not watch with me one hour?" Luke v. 4.

Mark xiv. 37.

And again, "From henceforth thy name shall be *Peter*:"

And, "Peter drew his sword, and cut off Malchus' ear:" John xviii. 10. Matt. xxvi. 51.

Ergo, saith he, The pope hath *universal authority* over the whole church of God.

Here be reasons even for a *pope*. He must needs be hard-hearted, that will not yield to them.

Notwithstanding, howsoever these reasons hold, Bernard saith: "The popes are the heads of the church." True it is. But again the same Bernard saith: "The same *heads* are the *ministers of Antichrist, deceivers, defrauders, raveners, traitors, the darkness of the world: wolves, Pilates, and devils.*" And this was sufficient for our purpose. St. Gregory saith: *Considerate, quid de gregibus agatur, quando lupi sunt pastores*: "When the wolf is become the shepherd, consider then, what may become of the flock." Gregor. hom. 17. in illa verba, Messis quidem multa. [tom. i. 1503.]

As for that St. Bernard saith: The *pope* is *Abel*: the *pope* is *Noe*: the *pope* is *Abraham*: the *pope* is *Melchisedech*: the *pope* is *Aaron*: the *pope* is *Moses*: the *pope* is *Samuel*: the *pope* is *Peter*: the *pope* is *Christ*: I doubt not but your own conscience will answer, it is too much. Yet of the two, that is a great deal more likely, that others have said, as I have alleged before: *The pope is Antichrist*. For both heaven and earth knoweth, *he is not Christ*. The pope is Christ.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 18. Divis. 1.

But, forsomuch as these men avouch the univer-^[Vol. iv. p. 53.]sal possession of the *catholic church* to be their own, and call us heretics, because we agree not in judgment with them, let us know, I beseech you, what proper mark and badge hath that church of theirs, whereby it may be known to be the *church* of God. Yewis it is not so hard a matter to find out God's church, if a man will seek it earnestly and diligently, and as he should. For the church of God is set upon a high and glistering place, in the top of an hill, and built upon the *foundation of the apostles and prophets*: "*There*" (saith Augustine) "*let us seek the church: there let us try our matters.*" And, as he saith again in another place: "*The church must be shewed out of the holy and canonical scriptures: and that which cannot be shewed out of them is not the church*"⁷⁴. Yet for all this, I wot not how, whether it be for fear, or for conscience, or despair of victory, these men alway abhor and fly the *word of God*, even as the thief flieth the gallows. And no wonder truly: for, like as men say, the *cantharus* by and by perisheth and dieth, as soon as it is laid in balm, notwithstanding balm be otherwise a most sweet smelling ointment: even so these men well see their own matter is damped and destroyed in the *word of God*, as if it were in poison. Therefore the *holy scriptures*, which our Saviour Jesus Christ did not only use for authority in all his speech, but did also at last seal up the same with his own blood, these men, to the intent they might with less business

Aug. de Unitat. Eccl. Catholice, cap. 3. [ix. 341.]

[Cap. 4.]

⁷⁴ [The exact words are not found in the 4th chapter of St. August. de Unit. Ecclesiæ: which is the reference in the original Apol. Lat.]

drive the people from the same, as from a thing dangerous and deadly, have used to call them a *bare letter, uncertain, unprofitable, dumb, killing, and dead*: which seemeth to us all one as if they should say, *The scriptures are to no purpose, or as good as none at all*. Hereunto they add also a similitude not very agreeable, how the scriptures be like to a *nose of wax, or a shipman's hose*⁷⁵: how they may be fashioned and plied all manner of ways, and serve all men's turns.

Albert Pi-
ghius in Con-
trover. de
Ecclesia.
[contr. 3.]

M. HARDING.

Where ye say, The church is builded upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, and shewed by the holy canonical scriptures; we confess the same with St. Augustine. When ye add, The church, which cannot be shewed out of the scriptures to be no church, we say, that though ^a St. Augustine have no such words in the chapters, which ye allege in the margin, yet were it never so much granted that he had those words in that place, they should make nothing for your purpose. St. Augustine in that book disputeth against the Donatists, who would restrain the catholic church to the only country of Afric, denying other Christian men to be members thereof. St. Augustine, refuting their heresy, declareth the Son of God to be head, and all the true faithful to be the body of the church: and that it is not sufficient to hold with the head alone, or with the body alone: but we must hold with both together, if we will be saved.

a Untruth.
For St. Au-
gustine in the
same places
and else-
where often
times saith
the same.

The Donatists did grant the head Jesus Christ, and denied his body the church. For this cause saith St. Augustine: *Ipsum caput de quo consentimus, ostendat nobis corpus suum, de quo dissentimus*: "Let the head, upon whom we agree, shew unto us his body, whereupon we disagree." The head is Christ, who spake first by his prophets, afterward by himself, and last of all by his apostles. *In his igitur omnibus querenda est ecclesia*: "In all these" (saith he) "the church must be sought."

b Untruth.
For St. Au-
gustine's
words are
general.

If thou mark, good reader, that which I have here rehearsed out of St. Augustine, it is to be seen, that he bindeth not the proof of the church simply to the holy scriptures, ^b but only in a case when he hath to do with an heretic, who will not admit the authority of the church. Therefore ^c a true church may be found, which is not shewed in the scriptures, so the contrary

c Here M.
Harding se-
cretly con-
fesseth that
his church of
Rome cannot
be shewed by
the scrip-
tures.

Where the
church is to
be sought.

⁷⁵ [There are no words in the original Lat. Apol. corresponding to "or a shipman's hose."]

thereof be not shewed in the scriptures.....Now if these defenders will have that to be no church which cannot be shewed out of scriptures, they shall understand, that as therein they play the Donatists, so we must needs follow St. Augustine in bringing scripture against them, not as the ^donly proof indeed, (which they falsely say,) but as a very good and chief kind of proof, most profitable in all cases, and necessary at such time as the adversary will admit none other proof, &c.

d Untruth.
For St. Chrysostom saith:
Nunc nullo modo cognoscitur, quasi vera ecclesia, nisi tantummodo per scripturas.

Wherefore it remaineth, that it is the synagogue of Antichrist and Lucifer: who, as he fell out of heaven like a lightning, so he maketh a blaze and show of a church in the earth for a time. But as we can tell when it was not born, so shall it not be long, but that through God's power it will vanish away, dispersed, and be scattered by the lightsome majesty of Christ's true church, which, from St. Peter's time to this day, flourished in her head the bishop of Rome, and in her members throughout the world,

e In the unity of the bishop of Rome.

^c which abide in the unity of the same Bishop.....

We esteem and understand the scriptures to be the sense and the word. If they can pretend the bare word, they think themselves good enough to make a sense of their own. Which bare word, as they misuse it, Pighius perhaps compareth to a nose of wax. But the scriptures he never meant to dishonour with that similitude. If it were lawful for us to use scripture after our own interpretation, as they do, we should not lack sufficient matter in the holy books to overthrow by our own applying all their false opinions and heresies. ^f But we are bound to that religious awe and reverence of them, that except we have an author to avouch the sense whereof we take hold, we dare bring forth nothing. And yet read our books who will, he shall lack neither scriptures in them, nor witnesses of our interpretation in any controversy of this age. Let it be agreed, that for decision of controversies, such sense of the scriptures be taken for scripture, which the Holy Ghost hath taught the church, and then let the world judge, who flieth the word of God, as the thief doth the gallows.....

f Untruth, manifest. For M. Harding knoweth that in the greatest cases that lie in question he can allege neither scripture nor doctors.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Contrary to that we have here alleged of St. Augustine, ye say: "A true church may be found, which is not shewed in the scriptures." Whereby it appeareth, ye are loath your church should come to the trial of this standard. But forasmuch as this quarrel groweth of St. Augustine, let St. Augustine himself be the judge. And to allege a few words instead of many, thus he saith: *Utrum ipsi ecclesiam teneant*, [suppl. *non nisi*] *divinarum scripturarum canonicis libris ostendant*.—*Ecclesiam Christi, sicut*

Augustin. de Unitat. Eccl. cap. 16. [ix. 373.] [Ibid. p. 372.]

ipsum caput Christum, in scripturis sanctis canonicis debemus agnoscere: “Whether they have the church or no, let them shew by the canonical books of the holy scriptures. We must know the church of Christ, even as we likewise know Christ, which is the head of the church, in the holy canonical scriptures.” Again he saith: *Ecclesiam sine ulla ambiguitate sancta scriptura demonstrat:* August. contra Cresconium Gram. lib. i. c. 33. [ix. 407.]
 “The holy scripture sheweth the church without any doubtfulness.” Again: *Quæstio est, ubi sit ecclesia. Quid ergo facturi sumus? Utrum in verbis nostris eam quæsituri, an in verbis capitis sui, Domini nostri Jesu Christi? Puto, quod in illius potius verbis eam quærere debemus, qui Veritas est, et optime novit corpus suum:* Augustin. de Unitat. Eccl. cap. 2. [ix. 338.]
 “The question or doubt is, where the church should be. What then shall we do? Whether shall we seek the church in our own words, or in the words of her head, which is our Lord Jesus Christ? In my judgment we ought rather to seek the church in his words: for that he is the truth, and best knoweth his own *body*.”

Again: *Non audiamus, Hæc dico, Hæc dicis: sed audiamus, Hæc dicit Dominus.....Ibi quæramus ecclesiam: ibi discutiamus causam nostram:* Augustin. de Unitat. Eccl. cap. 3. [ix. 340.]
 “Let us not hear these words, This say I, This sayest thou: but these words let us hear, Thus saith the Lord: there let us seek the church: there let us discuss our cause.” And again: *Nolo humanis documentis, sed divinis oraculis sanctam ecclesiam demonstrari:* In eod. cap. [ib. 341.]
 “I will not have the holy church to be shewed by man’s judgment, but by God’s word.”

Likewise saith St. Chrysostom: *Nunc nullo modo cognoscitur,.....quæ sit vera ecclesia Christi, nisi tantummodo per scripturas:* Chrysost. in Opere imperf. hom. 49. [vi app. 204.]
 “Now can no man know, which is the true church of Christ, but *only* by the scriptures.” Again he saith in like form of words: *Volens ergo quis cognoscere, quæ sit vera ecclesia Christi, unde cognoscat in tanta confusione similitudinis, nisi tantummodo per scripturas?* In eadem hom. [ibid.]
 “If a man be desirous to know, which is the true church of Christ, how can he know it in such a confusion of likeness, but only by the scriptures?” These words be so evident

and so plain, that no man with modesty may well deny them.

And whereas you say, all this notwithstanding, "A true church may be found, which is not shewed in the scriptures;" St. Ambrose saith: *Ecclesia fulget, non suo, sed Christi lumine*: "The church shineth" (or is known) "not by her own light, but by the light of Christ," which is, by the word of God.

Ambr. Hexameron, lib. 4. cap. 8. [i. 78.]

Chrysost. in Joh. hom. 58. [viii. 346.]

And Chrysostom saith: *Qui sacra non utitur scriptura, sed ascendit aliunde, id est, non concessa via, hic fur est, et latro*: "Whoso useth not the scripture, but getteth up another way, that is, by a way that is not lawful, he is a thief and a murderer." Again he saith: *Hierusalem hic semper ecclesiam intellige, quæ dicitur civitas pacis: cujus fundamenta posita sunt super montes scripturarum*: "Here by Jerusalem evermore understand thou the church, which is called the city of peace: the foundations whereof are laid upon the mountains of the scriptures."

Chrysost. in Matthe. [op. imp.] hom. 46. [vi. app. 195.]

Ye magnify your church of Rome, and say: "It shineth on high upon the mount." Yet St. Bernard saith to the pope and his clergy, as it is alleged before: *Vos estis tenebræ mundi*: "Ye are the darkness of the world." Therefore ye may not well vaunt yourselves so much of the brightness of your beams. As for that ye call our church the *synagogue of Lucifer and Antichrist*, we may well suffer it to blow over, as the vain unsavoury smoke of some impatient choleric humour. Our cause is not the worse, M. Harding, in the judgment of the wise, for that you have learned so readily to speak ill.

Bernard. in Cantica. [serm. 66. tom. iv. 1500.]

But what *Lovanian vanity* is this, to say, "The members of the church of Christ abide in the unity of the pope?" What scripture, or doctor, or father, ever told you of such *unity*? St. Paul saith: "We are all one" (not in the pope, but) in Christ Jesu." And what so great *unity* can you say there is, or hath been, in your popes? Platina saith: *Post Stephanum semper hæc consuetudo servata est, ut acta priorum pontificum sequentes aut infringent, aut omnino tollerent*: "It hath been an ordinary

Gal. iii. 28.

Platina in Stephano VI.

custom among the popes ever sithence the time of pope Stephen, that the *popes* that followed afterward would evermore either break or abolish the acts of the *popes* that had been before them." Erasmus saith:*Johannes XXII.* Erasm. in Annotat. in 1 Cor. vii. [p. 497.]
et Nicolaus totis decretis inter se pugnant, idque in his, quæ videntur ad fidei negotium pertinere: "Pope John XXII. and pope Nicolas in their whole *decrees* are contrary the one against the other: yea and that in matters that seem to belong to cases of the faith."

To be short, the *popes* have foully corrupted the *scriptures*: they have corrupted the decrees and canons of *councils*: they have been *sorcerers*, *idolaters*, *Scribes* and *Pharisees*: they have been *Arian* heretics, *Nestorian* heretics, *Monothelite* heretics, *Montanist* heretics: they have maintained damnable heresies against the *godhead of Christ*, against the *person of Christ*, against the *will of Christ*, and against the *immortality* of the soul: they have been contrary to themselves, one directly and expressly against another: yet must the *pope* bear up the whole church of God, even as Atlas beareth up the heavens? And unless all the world abide in him, is there no *unity in the church*?

So saith Hosius: *Unum præesse toti ecclesiæ, usque adeo est necessarium, ut absque hoc ecclesia una esse non possit.* Hosius in Petricovien. Confess. cap. 27. [leg. 26. fol. 19. col. 2.]
 "It is so necessary a thing that one have the government of the whole, that otherwise the church of God cannot be one."

Likewise it is noted in the *pope's own Glosses* upon his *Decretals*: *Constat ecclesiam ideo esse unam, quia in universali ecclesia unum est caput supremum,.....scilicet papa:* Clem. V. Ad nostrum: in Glossa. [col. 256. lit. y.]
 "It is plain, that the *church* is one, for that in the universal *church* there is one *supreme head*, that is, the *pope*." Another of your doctors doubteth not to step yet a little further, and thus to expound the words of Christ: *Fiet unum ovile, et unus pastor: quod quidem de Christo intelligi non potest, sed de aliquo alio ministro, qui præsit loco ejus:* Joh. de Parisiis, de Potest. Regia et Papali, cap. 3. [p. 111.]
 "There shall be one fold and one Shepherd. These words we may not understand of Christ, but of some other minister, that may rule in his room." By which doctor's

catholic judgment we find, that the *unity of the church hangeth not of Christ, but of the pope.*

But these be over vain and gross vanities. For though the pope were no pope, yea though *Antichrist* were the pope, yet is Christ able to hold his church in perfect *unity.*

Ephes. iv. 15.

St. Paul saith: *Christus est caput, ex quo totum corpus coagmentatur, et connectitur*: “Christ is the head, of whom the whole body” (of the church) “is framed fast, and joined together.”

Chrysost. ad Coloss. hom. 7. [xi. 372.]

Therefore St. Chrysostom saith: *Ex hoc capite corpus habet, et ut sit, et ut bene sit. Quid relicto capite membris adhæres?* “Of this head” (that is Christ) “the body hath both to be, and also well to be. What, cleavest thou to the *members*, and leavest the *head*?”

Augustin. in Johan. tract. 6. [iii. pt. 2. 332.]

This is the *unity of the church*, that the whole flock may hear the voice of that *one Shepherd*, and follow him. And that *one Shepherd* is *Christ the Son of God*, and not the pope. Therefore St. Augustine saith: *Per hanc potestatem, quam solum [al. solus] sibi Christus retinuit [al. tenuit],stat unitas ecclesie....., de qua dictum est, Una est columba mea*: “By this power, which Christ” (he saith not hath given over to the pope, but) “hath reserved only to himself, standeth the *unity of the church*: of which *unity* it is said, *My dove is one.*”

Ye say, there appeareth in your books sufficient abundance of scriptures, touching any controversy of this age, and that according to the very sense and meaning of the same, together with the consent and judgment of the holy fathers. But for us (ye say) we build only upon the bare words, and make a meaning of our own.

Matt. iv. 6.

Indeed it is no great mastery for you to arm yourself with some show of *scriptures*. The devil was not altogether void of such furniture, when he came to tempt Christ. St. Cyril saith: *.....Omnes hæretici de scriptura divinitus inspirata sui colligunt erroris occasiones*: “All heretics out of the heavenly inspired scriptures gather occasion of their error.” Athanasius saith: *Hæretici scripturarum verbis pro esca utuntur*: “Heretics use the words of the scriptures for a bait.”

In Concil. Chalcedon. Actione 1. [vi. 673.]

Athan. contra Arian. orat. 1. [i. 273.]

Tertullian. de Baptismo. [c. 1. p. 224.]

Tertullian saith: *.....Fidem ex his impugnat, ex quibus*

constat: "An heretic assaulteth the faith by the same words of God that breed the faith."

But forasmuch as ye say ye bear such awe and reverence unto the *word of God*, and in the interpretation thereof follow only the sense of the Holy Ghost, and the judgment of the doctors and fathers of the church, for some trial of your truth herein, let us see, how discreetly and reverently ye have used the same.

In your late *council holden at Lateran in Rome*, one Simon Begnius, the bishop of Modrusia, saith thus unto pope Leo: *Ecce venit Leo de tribu Juda, radix David*, &c. Concil. Lateran. sess. 6. p. 601. [Harduin. ix. 1687. b.] *Te Leo beatissime salvatorem expectavimus*, &c.: "Behold the *Lion* is come of the *tribe of Juda*, the root of David, &c. O most blessed Leo, we have looked for thee to be our *Saviour*." In your late *chapter at Trident*, Cornelius the bishop of Bitonto said thus: *Papa lux venit in mundum: et dilexerunt homines tenebras magis quam lucem. Omnis, qui male agit, odit lucem, et non venit ad lucem*: Concil. Trident. Cornelius Bitontinus. [Crabb. iii. 981.] "The pope, being the light, is come into the world, and men have loved the darkness more than the light. Every man that doth evil hateth" (the *pope*, that is) "the light, and cometh not to the light ⁷⁶."

Pope Adrian saith: *Papa [leg. præsul summus] non judicabitur a quoquam: quia scriptum est, Non est discipulus supra magistrum*: "No man shall judge the *pope*: Concil. [ed. Crabb.] tom. 2. Decreta collecta per Adrianum, p. 613. for it is written, The scholar is not above his master."

The *pope* suffereth the ambassadors of Sicilia to lie prostrate on the ground, and thus to cry unto him, as if it had been unto Christ: *Qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere nostri: qui tollis peccata mundi, dona nobis pacem*: "O thou" (holy father) "that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us: thou that takest away the sins of the world, give us peace." Paulus Æmilii, lib. 7. [fol. clx. lin. 37.]

Pope Sixtus saith: "Whoso accuseth the *pope* can

⁷⁶ [Crabb. Concil. "Quis erit tam injustus rerum æstimator, qui non dicat, Papa lux venit in mundum? sed dilexerunt ho-
" mines magis tenebras quam lucem." This passage is not found in Harduin's ed. of the Councils.]

Conc. tom. i.
in purgat.
Sexti.
[Crabb. tom.
i. 608.]

never be forgiven." And his reason is this: *Quia qui peccat in Spiritum Sanctum, non remittetur ei, neque in hac vita, neque in futura*: "He that sinneth against the Holy Ghost shall never be forgiven, neither in this world, nor in the world to come." And by these words of the scriptures, so well applied, he concludeth, that no man may accuse the pope. And is the pope indeed *the lion of the tribe of Juda*? Is the pope *the root of David*? Is the pope *the light*? Is the pope *the saviour of mankind*? Is the pope that *Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world*? Was this the very sense of the *Holy Ghost*? Was this the meaning of the scriptures? And to leave a heap of other examples, (for they are infinite,) you yourself, M. Harding, have often used the scriptures in like sort.

M. Harding,
fol. 99, a.

Thus ye say, "The Son of man came not to destroy" (the souls of men) "but to save. *Ergo*, The substance of bread in the sacrament is not annihilate or consumed to nothing."

Hosius contra Bren-
tium, lib. 4.
fol. 178, a.
[ed. 1562. fol.
209. H.]

And this, ye say, "was the sense and meaning of the Holy Ghost." This is the judgment of all the doctors and holy fathers. Such religious awe and reverence ye bear towards the *word of God*. Yet saith your doctor Hosius, the scripture, as it is alleged by us, is the word of the devil: but as it is alleged and handled by you, so only it is the word of God. If ye had not utterly wiped all shame from your faces, ye would neither make such mockeries of God's holy word, nor so lewdly abuse the people of God.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 19. and 20. Divis. 1.

Woteth not the bishop of Rome, that these things [Vol. iv. p. 53.] are spoken by his own minions? or understandeth he not, he hath such champions to fight for him? Let him hearken then, how holily and how godly one Hosius writeth of this matter, a bishop in Polonia, as he testifieth of himself: a man doubtless

well spoken, and not unlearned, and a very sharp and a stout maintainer of that side. Thou wilt marvel⁷⁷, I suppose, how any good man could either conceive so wickedly, or write so despitefully of those words which he knew proceeded from God's mouth, and specially in such sort as he would not have it seem his own private opinion alone, but the common opinion of all that band. He dissembleth, I grant you indeed, and hideth what he is, and setteth forth the matter so, as though it were not he and his side, but the Zuenkfeldian heretics, that so did speak⁷⁸. "*We (saith he) will bid away with the same scriptures, whereof we see brought, not only divers but also contrary interpretations: and we will hear God speak, rather than we will resort to the naked elements or bare words of the scriptures, and appoint our salvation to rest in them. It behoveth not a man to be expert in the law and scripture, but to be taught of God. It is but lost labour that a man bestoweth in the scriptures. For the scripture is a creature, and a certain bare letter.*" This is Hosius' saying, uttered altogether with the same spirit and the same mind wherewith in times past the heretics Montanus and Marcion were moved, who, as it is written of them, used to say, when with contempt they rejected the *holy scriptures*, that themselves knew many mo, and better things, than either *Christ* or the *apostles* ever knew.

Hosius de expresso verbo Dei. [ed. 1562. fol. 242. F.]

⁷⁷ [Apol. Lat. "mirabitur," here rendered by lady Bacon "Thou wilt marvel," is in the other contemporary version more correctly translated, "One will wonder."]

⁷⁸ [The Latin Apology has not

this sentence. It occurs in the edition of the Defence of 1567, and was first inserted in the two English translations, for a reason which will be explained in the note ⁸⁰ below.]

What then shall I say here, O ye principal posts⁷⁸ of religion, O ye archgovernors of Christ's church? is this that your reverence, which ye give to God's word? The holy scriptures, which St. Paul saith came by the inspiration of God, which God did commend by so many miracles, wherein are the most perfect prints of Christ's own steps, which all the holy fathers, apostles, and angels, which Christ himself, the Son of God, as often as was needful, did allege for testimony and proof: will ye, as though they were unworthy for you to hear, bid them avaunt? That is, will ye enjoin God to keep silence, who speaketh to you most clearly by his own mouth in the scriptures? Or, that *word*, whereby alone, as Paul saith, we are reconciled to God, and which the prophet David saith is *holy and pure, and shall last for ever*, will ye call that but a *bare and dead letter*? or will ye say, that all our labour is lost, which is bestowed in that thing which Christ hath commanded us diligently to search, and to have evermore before our eyes? And will ye say, that Christ and the apostles meant with subtlety to deceive the people, when they exhorted them to read the *holy scriptures*, that thereby they might flow in all wisdom and knowledge? No marvel at all, though these men despise us and all our doings, seeing they set so little by God himself and his infallible sayings. Yet was it but want of wit in them, to the intent they might hurt us, to do so extreme injury to the *word of God*⁷⁹.

But Hosius will here make exclamation, and say, that we do him wrong, and that these be not his

⁷⁸ [Apol. Lat. "columina," *al.* "culmina," *al.* "columnæ."]

⁷⁹ [Bishop Jewel has here omitted Harding's answer.]

own words, but the words of the heretic Zuenkfeldius. But how then, if Zuenkfeldius make exclamation on the other side, and say, that the same very words be not his, but Hosius' own words? For tell me, where hath Zuenkfeldius ever written them? or, if he have written them, and Hosius have judged the same to be wicked, why hath not Hosius spoken so much as one word to confute them? Howsoever the matter go, although Hosius peradventure will not allow of those words, yet he doth not disallow the meaning of the words. For well near in all controversies, and namely touching the use of the holy *communion under both kinds*, although the words of Christ be plain and evident, yet doth Hosius disdainfully reject them as no better than *cold and dead elements*: and commandeth us to give faith to certain new lessons, appointed by his church, and to, I wot not what, revelations of the Holy Ghost. And Pighius saith: "*Men ought not to believe, no not the most clear and manifest words of the scriptures, unless the same be allowed for good by the interpretation and authority of the church:*" whereby he meaneth the *church of Rome*⁸⁰.

[Hieracl. Eccles. lib. 1. c. 2.]

⁸⁰ [The whole of this paragraph was added in the first English edition, subsequently to the original Latin edition, in which there is nothing to correspond to it; nor has it ever been inserted in subsequent editions of the Latin. It appears that after the first appearance of the original, something occurred to make the bishop doubt the correctness of his statement respecting Hosius. The Editor, after an attentive examination of the passage quoted from Hosius, thinks that bishop Jewel was perfectly justified in attributing the

words to Hosius himself. To guard however against the possibility of error, the explanatory paragraph was introduced into the two contemporary English translations, that of lady Bacon, and that of "the man translator," as Harding distinguishes him. And, as the two translations, which differ in other respects, agree in giving this paragraph verbatim, it is probable that the insertion took place with the sanction, and perhaps from the dictation, of Jewel. The fact of such an addition ought certainly to

M. HARDING.

How ignorantly, wickedly, and stubbornly the author of this Apology burdeneth the reverend father in God and honourable prelate cardinal Hosius with that he never said, it is not unknown to all men who have read that book which he wrote, *De Expresso Verbo Dei*, "Of the Express Word of God." Here I ask so much pardon, as to detect an heretical touch or two, before I make direct answer to the foul slandering of Hosius.

First, I note with what fidelity these new holy brethren do their things. It may be thought that the secretary of this new clergy, at his penning of the Apology, saw not Hosius' book, *Of the Express Word of God*. But as they have been conversant in St. Augustine, Hierom, Chrysostom, and the ancient fathers, so use they Hosius at this time, that is to say, they read neither the old fathers with any diligence, neither the writers of our time. But by snaps and pieces either themselves write out here and there a line or two, or use that which some of their own sect hath taken out of them. So that for most part they never know the true meaning of the place which they allege. But using patched note books, and bringing in scattered authorities, they be deceived themselves, and deceive others. And he that took the note knew well they were not the words of Hosius, and did but only put the name of Hosius unto them, because they were taken out of his book. The writer of this Apology not knowing, nor not remembering so much, when he found in the note book the name of Hosius with such words, he did rashly put them in print, to his own great shame and discredit. If this excuse be not true, we must needs lay marvellous malice to the said writer, who wittingly and of set purpose did impute these words to Hosius, which he reported by way of misliking of them, and shewing whose heresy they contained.

Now let the defenders choose, whether they will have their secretary condemned of ignorance, or of malice. Howsoever it be, mark yet the third point, which hereof we will gather. The Apology was scant printed and published, but that gross error was out of hand espied, and word thereof brought to the author, I mean him that penned it. But what did he? Did he confess that he was deceived? did he cry Hosius mercy? No, no. That is not the wont of heretics. They will go forward with the matter once begun, whatsoever come of it. What did he then? When it should be set forth in English, and word came to him thereof, he made an excuse, I warrant you meet for an heretic, whose property it is *proficere in pejus*, as St. Paul saith, to pro-

have been stated in all the English translations, and especially here.]

ceed to worse and worse, to take his degree backward, and of a great fault to make a far greater. For whereas before (as charity moveth me to think) he had made an error, supposing Hosius to have said that which he had not, afterward by stubborn maintaining of it, he sheweth what spirit he is of. And when he might reasonably have excused his ignorance, chose rather spitefully to discover his malice; as it shall manifestly appear by the circumstance of the thing. He layeth to Hosius' charge, and in his person to all our charges, that we do not esteem the holy scriptures. He proveth it by certain words alleged out of a treatise made by Hosius, *De Expresso Verbo Dei*. The words are here put in the Apology, as the reader may see. The true argument of Hosius' book is no other, than to shew that all heretics have alleged the words of God, as they be written; but none of them all have taken the right understanding of God's words, as they do indeed signify. For that only the catholic church attaineth unto, because only it hath the Holy Ghost. All heretics have brought for their opinions the written word of God so long, until at the last (saith Hosius) there were found, who by the words of the scriptures took upon them to

[Fol. 241. D.] take away all authority from scriptures. *Natum est* (saith he) *novum quoddam prophetarum genus, qui non sunt veriti scripturarum autoritate scripturis autoritatem omnem detrahere. En quo perduxit rem tandem Satanas*: "A certain new kind of prophets is risen, who stick not by the authority of scriptures to take away all authority from scriptures. See whither at the length the devil hath brought the matter."

Now afterward expounding this matter more at large, he declareth the captain of that heresy to have been Zuenkfeldius. He sheweth that by a text of scripture, where David saith, "I will hear what our Lord speaketh in me," Zuenkfeldius went

[Fol. 242. F.] about to will men to hear what God telleth every man by inspiration, rather than to give attendance to the written word of God. And whiles Hosius reporteth what Zuenkfeldius said for the maintenance of his fond heresy, among other his words these are, which he brought in this Apology against Hosius, and against the catholics; whereas it is neither Hosius, nor any catholic that speaketh them, but only Zuenkfeldius himself⁸¹.....

Hitherto we have shewed, that the words alleged in the Apology, under the name of Hosius, make neither against him, nor against us, as not being his words, nor ours, but only the words

⁸¹ [Notwithstanding all that Harding may say, the words appear to the Editor to have been said by Hosius in his own person, and not in that of Zuenkfeldius. At least, there is nothing to shew in Hosius, that he adduces this as a quotation from any one. Yet he does speak (shortly after) reverently of the sacred scriptures rightly interpreted.]

of Zuenkfeldius. Well, what credit may we give to this man in expounding the word of God, (whose true meaning he may falsify at his pleasure, because we cannot bring forth God himself to declare his words,) seeing he dareth to burden Hosius with these words, which Hosius himself, being yet alive, can declare to have another meaning, as the book itself doth witness to all that list to read the same? This was a great fault to impute so horrible an heresy to Hosius unjustly. This was a great ignorance to charge him with that heresy which he refuteth and impugneth. They are great crimes, and yet such as might rise of misreport and ignorance. But when he was told of them, he should of reason have corrected them. He should have repented with Peter, and not despaired with Cain and Judas.

But what did he, when he understood he had erred? He addeth a gloss far more malicious than the former error was. For granting that Hosius setteth out the matter so, as though neither he nor any of his side, but the heretics Zuenkfeldians spake so, this notwithstanding he burdeneth both him and the catholics with it, saying that he dissembleth, and hideth what he is. Sir, was this the way to amend your fault, to grant that Hosius spake against the Zuenkfeldians, and yet to bear men in hand he favoured them? If he had favoured their heresy, what needed he to refell it? But how say you that Hosius dissembleth, and hideth what he is, sith that even here in two places in most plain words you lay the Zuenkfeldian heresy to his charge? Read your own book. Before the allegation of Zuenkfeldius' heresy, say you not thus? "We, saith he, will bid away," &c. And after the allegation, have you not these words, "This is Hosius' saying?" How standeth all this together? You have forgotten the proverb that biddeth a liar to be mindful. I cannot tell how to name this kind of your dealing, lying or detraction, slandering or malicious speaking. But, sir, if Hosius have spoken evil, why give you not witness against him of evil? If he have spoken well, even by your own confession, in reputed the Zuenkfeldians for heretics, why find you fault with him for his good words, such, I say, as yourself confess to be good? You reprove him who speaketh not against Zuenkfeldius: and again you grant he speaketh against him: and yet because you had once reproved him, you will continue in it without reason, learning, or wit. But it must needs so be: for without pertinacity no man is either a perfect heretic, or a perfect slanderer.....

If yet you stand in defence of it, all the world will account you for a desperate person. For no man that ever saw Hosius' works can think that he was guilty of that you burden him with. But some man might think you were deceived, and mistook Hosius. But sith you grant you do not now mistake him, and yet charge him with avouching that which he holdeth for heresy, he that

understandeth this much of you, may assure himself that you are disposed to belie and slander Hosius, though it cost you the damnation of your soul. For shame, man, repent, and revoke that, for which your own conscience stinteth not to bark at you⁸².....

⁸³ "But Hosius" (say they) "peradventure will not allow the words of Zuenfeldius: yet he doth not disallow the meaning of the words." Well and clerkly reasoned. As though words were allowed or disallowed for any other so principal a cause as for their meaning. And therefore he that disalloweth words hath much more disallowed the meaning of them. "Yet" (say they) "of the holy communion under both kinds he rejecteth the plain words of Christ, as dead and cold elements." Verily a man might think this book was set forth by some enemy of our new English clergy, it is so much to their defacing, had not themselves at divers times acknowledged it for a whelp of their own litter. A man for his life cannot find one leaf in it without many lies.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

I cannot greatly blame you, M. Harding, though you shew yourself hot and vehement in defence of Hosius. For of him you and some of your fellows may say, as Carneades said sometime of Chrysippus: *Nisi Chrysippus fuisset, ego non essem*: "If Chrysippus had not been, then had I never been." For had not Hosius been good unto you, and spared you part of his furniture, such as it was, your *divinity* had been full bare.

Ye say, we read neither the old writers nor the new, but are utterly ignorant, and void of all learning, and in respect of the beams of your knowledge, know nothing. It were a very ambitious and a childish vanity, to make vaunts of learning. Forasmuch as ye seem desirous of the fame of great reading, ye shall have the whole praise and glory of it, M. Harding, without contention. We will rather say with St. Paul: "We know nothing,"¹ Cor. ii. 2. but only Jesus Christ crucified upon his cross." Yet not-

⁸² [Harding adds here: "The man who translated your book, and likewise the woman, seemeth to be accessory to your fault."]

⁸³ [Bishop Jewel has here omitted a considerable part of Harding's answer in his 20th chapter,

tending to shew that there is no foundation for supposing, as according to Harding the English Apology insinuates, that "Hosius feigneth these words upon Zuenfeldius."]

withstanding, we are neither so ignorant, nor so idle, but that we are able, and have leisure to read, as well the *old doctors and the fathers* of the church, as also your light uncivil pamphlets and blotted papers: which, God wot, in all respects are very new. And for either of them we are much ashamed in your behalf: for the *old doctors and fathers*, to see them of your part, either of wilfulness, or of forgetfulness, or of ignorance, so foully misused: of your own *papers and novelties*, to see them with untruth and other uncourteous speech so fully freighted.

But touching Hosius, ye condemn us utterly, either of *ignorance* or of *malice*. For the words wherein we find such fault were uttered by him, as you say, not as any part of his own judgment, but only as in the person of the *heretic Zuenkfeldius*. Therefore ye say, we “charge him wrongfully with the allowing of that thing which he expressly and plainly reproveth.”

First of all, the *author* of the Apology protesteth, that if there were any oversight herein, it proceeded only of error, and not of malice; as it may well appear in that he was not deceived alone. For if he were deceived in mistaking these words, divers others, the best learned of this age, have been deceived therein as well as he. Nicolaus Gallus⁸³ hereof writeth thus: *Hosius cardinalis, legatus sanctissimi, et præsidentis consilii Tridentini, in suo libro, De Expresso Verbo Dei, ait, Nos vero Dei de cælo sententiam potius expectabimus, &c. Non oportet legis aut scripturæ esse peritum, sed a Deo doctum. Vanus est labor, qui scripturis impenditur. Scriptura enim creatura est, et ege- num quoddam elementum: “Cardinal Hosius, legate unto the most holy father, and president of the council of Tri- dent, in his book, De Expresso Verbo Dei, saith thus: ‘We will rather wait for God’s will from heaven, &c. It behoveth not a man to be skilful in the law of God, or in the scriptures, but to be taught of God. It is but lost labour that is spent in the scriptures. For the scrip- ture is a creature, and a poor kind of outward element.’”*

Nicolaus
Gallus.

⁸³ [The Editor has sought in vain for the works cited in this and the five following references.]

Thus Nicolaus Gallus burdeneth your own catholic friend Hosius with these words, and not the *heretic* Zuenkfeldius.

Likewise saith Flacius Illyricus, speaking of the same words of Hosius: *Unum locum ex plurimis proferam, in quo Hosius alterius cujusdam sententiam de hac re citans, comprobatur: Nos Dei de cælo sententiam potius expectabimus, &c. Vanus est labor, qui scripturis impenditur:* “One place I will allege out of many, where Hosius bringing in the saying of one certain man” (meaning Zuenkfeldius) “alloweth well of the same.” These words, saith Illyricus, Hosius uttereth in the name and person of Zuenkfeldius: yet nevertheless he *alloweth them as his own*.

To like purpose writeth Jacobus Andreæ; who, after he had reported all the foresaid words, in the end concludeth thus: *Hactenus Hosius: quæ verba sive Hosius suo, sive aliorum nomine recitet, certe hanc esse Asotî et Hosii de sacra scriptura sententiam, non est obscurum:* “Thus far Hosius: which words howsoever Hosius report them, either in his own name, or in the name of some other, without all doubt, this is the judgment that both Asotus and Hosius have of the holy scripture.”

So likewise saith that most grave and learned father Johannes Brentius: *Interea vociferantur, sacram scripturam esse dubiam, ambiguum, præceptorem mutum, literam occidentem, literam mortuam: adeoque, si reverendis illis patribus libuerit, Æsopi fabulas:* “In the mean while they cry out, that the *holy scriptures are blind and doubtful, a dumb schoolmaster, a killing writ, a dead letter:* yea, and if it shall like these reverend fathers, no better than Æsop’s fables.” Perhaps ye will say of these learned men, as ye say of some others: “They used only their patched note-books, and scattered authorities, by snaps and pieces, here and there a line or two, and understood not what they wrote.” Notwithstanding, whatsoever it shall please you to say, as therein your grace is very great, yet you see by these few, and must needs confess, if the author of the Apology, touching this place of Hosius,

Flacius Illyricus, in Norma Concilii.

Jacob. Andr. de Authorit. Sac. Script.

Johan. Brentius in Præf. in Jac. Andr. contra Hosium.

were haply overseen by error, yet he had so many of the best learned of this age to keep him company in his error. Verily they say not as you say, *Thus saith Zuenkfeldius*: they say as we say, *Thus saith Hosius*. If Hosius were able to blind so many, we must think he was a skilful writer.

The fairest colour ye can lay hereon is this: "Howsoever these words be uttered by Hosius, yet was this no part of his meaning." Yet Jacobus Andreæ saith: *Hanc esse Asoti et Hosii sententiam, non est obscurum*: "Without doubt this is the very meaning of Asotus and Hosius."

Jacob, Andr.

Flac. Illyricus: Alterius ejusdam sententiam de hac recitans, comprobat.

And Illyricus saith: "Hosius alleging the saying of one certain man," (whereby he meaneth the heretic Zuenkfeldius,) "*alloweth well of the same.*"

But forasmuch as ye say, "This gloss is more malicious than the former error: and that therein we spitefully discover our malice, without reason, without learning, without wit, and require us to repent for shame," as if it were a sin, not against Hosius, but against the Holy Ghost; I beseech you therefore indifferently to consider, with what reverence and modesty, not only Hosius, but also sundry others your friends of that side, have used to speak and write of the *word of God*.

Ludovicus, a canon of the church of Lateran in Rome, in an oration openly pronounced in your late *chapter at Trident*, saith thus: "*Ecclesia est vivum pectus Christi: scriptura autem est quasi mortuum atramentum*:" "The church is the lively breast of Christ: but the scripture is as it were *dead ink*." Likewise said the bishop of Poitiers

Ludovic. Citatur ab Illyr. in Normæ Concil.

Johan. Sleidanus, lib. 23.

in the same your chapter: *Scriptura est res inanimis, et muta, sicut etiam sunt reliquæ leges politicæ*: "The scripture is a dead and dumb thing, as are all other politic laws." Albertus Pighius saith: *Si dixeris, Hæc referri oportere ad judicium scripturarum, communis te sensus ignarum esse comprobas: sunt enim scripturæ muti judices*: "If thou say, These matters must be put over to the judgment of the scriptures, thou shewest thyself to be void of common reason. *For the scriptures are dumb judges, and cannot speak.*"

Alber. Pighius, Contravers. 3. de Ecclesia.

Eckius calleth the scriptures *Evangelium nigrum, et theologiam atramentariam*: "The black gospel, and inken divinity." Again Pighius saith: *Ecclesia habet illam potestatem, ut possit scriptis quibusdam impertiri canonicam auctoritatem, quam nec ex se, nec ex suis autoribus habent*: "The church hath power to give canonical authority unto certain writings, which otherwise they have not, neither of themselves, nor of their authors." There may be certain books allowed for scripture, saith he, that have no credit nor authority of themselves. Therefore the meaning hereof must needs be this: "The church" (of Rome) "hath authority to make scriptures." Again he saith: *Sunt scripturæ, ut non minus vere quam festive dixit quidam, velut nasus cereus, qui se horsum illorsum, et in quamcunque volueris partem, trahi, retrahi, fingique facile permittit*: "As one man both truly and merrily said, The scripture is like a *nose of wax*, that easily suffereth itself to be drawn backward and forward, and to be moulded and fashioned this way and that way, and howsoever ye list."

Martin. Kemnitius in Examine Con. Trident. p. 32. [pt. 1. p. 6.]
 Mart. Kemnitius in eodem Exam. p. 240. [pt. 1. p. 6.]

Pighius Hierar. lib. 3. c. 3. [ed. 1538. fol. lxxx.]

Thus, M. Harding, ye teach the people to reverence and weigh the *word of God*. Ye call it *dead ink*: a *lifeless matter*: a *dumb judge* that cannot speak: a *black gospel*: *inken divinity*: a *nose of wax*: and a thing utterly void of authority of itself. Examine these places: weigh these words. They are *no lies*: they are *no slanders*. Judge uprightly: remove affection: ye shall find that Hosius, and Zuenkfeldius, and all the rest of your brethren, touching the authority and credit of *God's word*, accord in one. For proof whereof, when objection was made, that king David, being not a bishop, but only a temporal prince, had written the Psalms, that is to say, the very key of the scriptures, Hosius made answer: *Quidni scriberet?.....Scribimus indocti doctique poemata passim*: "Wrote David *Psalms*? And why should he not write them? Horace saith: We write ballads every body, learned and unlearned, tag and rag." So unreverently, and like an heathen, he scorneth and scoffeth at the *scriptures of God*, and likeneth the heavenly ditties of the Holy

Hosius lib. 2. contra Bren-
 tium. [169. F.]

Ghost to a vile, heathenish, wanton ballad. This in Zuenkfeldius had been great blasphemy: ye allow it in Hosius as a virtue.

Luke vii. 30.

St. Luke saith: *Pharisæi et jurisperiti spreverunt consilium Dei in semetipsis*: "The Pharisees and learned in the law despised the counsel of God in themselves." Ire-

Iren. lib. 3. c. 2. [p. 174.]

næus saith: *Hæretici accusant scripturas, quasi non recte habeant, nec sint ex autoritate*, &c.: "Heretics find fault with the scriptures, as if they were not well written, and as if they were not of sufficient authority," &c. And thus they do, to the end to cause the people to loath and doubt the word of life, and so to become captive to their own

Nicol. Cusan. ad Bohemos, epist. 2. [p. 834.]

traditions. Therefore cardinal Cusanus saith thus: *Hæc est omnium sane intelligentium sententia, qui scripturarum auctoritatem et intellectum* [suppl. *ut Augustinus de evangeliiis dicit*] *in ecclesiæ approbatione fundant.....et non e converso, ecclesiæ fundamentum* [leg. *firmamentum*] *in scripturarum auctoritate locant*, &c. *Dico, nulla esse Christi præcepta, nisi quæ per ecclesiam pro talibus accepta sunt*: "This is the judgment of all them that mean well, which found the authority and understanding of the scriptures in the allowance of the church: but contrariwise lay not the foundation of the church in the authority of the scriptures. Thus I say, there are no commandments of Christ, but only such as by the church are allowed for Christ's commandments." So saith your highest doctor Albertus Pighius:

Albert. Pighius Hierar. lib. 1. cap. 2.

Apostoli quædam conscripserunt, non ut scripta illa præessent fidei, et religioni nostræ, sed potius ut subessent: "The apostles wrote certain things, not that their writings should be above our faith and religion, but rather that they should be under." Johannes Maria Verractus saith:

Johan. Maria Verractus, editus, an. 1561.

Determinatio ecclesiæ appellatur evangelium: "The determination of the church is called the gospel ⁸⁴."

Therefore Hosius by his episcopal authority pronounceth

⁸⁴ [The Editor has not succeeded in finding this passage in the edition of 1544, which is the only copy to which he has had access: but the superiority of the

church over the scriptures is again and again asserted in the part of the work (against Luther), entitled, *De Ecclesiæ Autoritate*.]

sentence definitive in this wise: *Quod ecclesia docet, expressum Dei verbum est: quod contra sensum et consensum ecclesiæ docetur, expressum diaboli verbum est*: “Whatsoever the church teacheth,” (by the *church* he meaneth the *pope*, and his *cardinals*, and the *church of Rome*, &c.) “that is the express word of God: whatsoever is taught against the meaning and consent of the church, that is the express word of the devil.”

This was sometime an ordinary practice of sundry *old heretics*, to scorn and to disdain the *scriptures of God*; and to ground themselves upon other conclusions and imaginations of their own. So the heretic Carpocrates said, He knew more than either Christ himself, or his apostles⁸⁵.

Tertullian saith: *Discipuli Montani dicunt, Paracletum plura in Montano dixisse, quam Christum in evangelio protulisse: nec tantum plura, sed etiam meliora atque majora*: “The disciples of Montanus the heretic said, that the Holy Ghost uttered mo things in Montanus their master, than ever Christ uttered in the gospel: and not only mo things, but also greater and better things.” And again they said: *Paulus ex parte sciebat, et ex parte prophetabat. Nondum enim venerat quod perfectum est*: “Paul knew in part, and prophesied in part. For the perfection” (that was afterward in Montanus) “was not yet come.” Therefore it is not universally true, M. Harding, that you say, “All heretics have alleged the *scriptures*.” For some heretics, in whose steps ye seem to tread, have made light of and disdained the *scriptures*, as well as you. But as some *heretics* have alleged the *scriptures*, as you do, without sense, even so all *heretics* are evermore reprov'd by the *scriptures*, as you be. And that is the cause, that you and your fellows, for the most part, so fearfully shun the *scriptures*. “For he that doth evil fleeth the light.”

Therefore, whereas ye call us forth, and bid us humbly

⁸⁵ [Epiphanius says, that some thought themselves *equal* in knowledge to our Saviour, but superior to the apostles.]

Hosius de Expresso Verbo Dei, p. 97. [ed. 1562. fol. 252. C.]

Epiphani. lib. 1. Hieres. 27. [l. 103.]

Tertullian. de Præscription. [c. 52. p. 223.]

Augustinus ad Quodvult-deum, Hæres. 26. [viii. 10.]

to cry you mercy, first bid Hosius your schoolmaster to recant his errors: will him to speak more reverently of *God's word*: for it is holy. Let him confess, and repent his blasphemy in comparing the *scriptures* of God with heathenish ballads. Recant you the errors, that Pighius, Cusanus, Eckius, and others your doctors and fellows have set abroad: and the author of the Apology shall do whatsoever shall behove him.

Remember also, how unjust and untrue reports you yourself and your fellows have wittingly and willingly published, and blazed in writing, not sparing any man whom it pleased you to touch with slander. You yourself in this self-same book have written thus: "The learned gospellers of the sea towns in Saxony teach, that there is no hell at all." I beseech you, M. Harding, where saw you these *heretics*? what were their names? In what sermon, in what book, in what talk, opened they this heresy? In what language spake they? what were their words? who ever either knew them, or saw them, or heard them, or dreamed of them, but yourself alone, or some other as idly occupied as yourself? And dare you so vainly to slander a whole country, without proof, without witness, without ground? Leave this fondness. No man believeth you, no not your own fellows, no not yourself. It is too childish. Vanity itself would not be so vain.

Another of your company there thus most unjustly slandereth that godly father, doctor Peter Martyr: *Petrus Martyr.....negat Christum esse nostrum deprecatozem*: "Peter Martyr denieth, that Christ is our Intercessor ⁸⁶." Likewise again with one general slander he misreporteth all the professors of the gospel whatsoever: *Omnes evangelici pseudomartyres negant Christum venisse in carne*: "All the gospellers" (whom he thought it better to call the false witnesses of the gospel) "deny that Christ ever came in the flesh." I will press you no further with examples of your immoderate slanders. As your uncour-

M. Harding,
fol. 141. b.

Copus Dial.
3. p. 331.

Copus Dial.
6. p. 878. [in
marg.]

⁸⁶ [Copus gives as his authority for this slander on Peter Martyr, Barthol. Camerarius.]

teous tongue hath no bridle, so your waste words have no end.

All these, and other like reports, your conscience knoweth are most untrue. Yet have ye not doubted thus to hazard your whole credit, and vainly with the same to feed the world. Suffer me, therefore, M. Harding, to answer you with your own words: "For shame, man, repent, and revoke that, for which your own conscience stinteth not to bark against yourself."

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 21. *Divis. 1.*

And yet, as though this were too little, they also burn the *holy scriptures*, as in times past wicked king Aza, or as Antiochus or Maximinus did, and are wont to name them *heretics' books*. And out of doubt, as it seemeth, they would do, as Herod in old time did in Jewry, that he might with more surety keep still his usurped dominion: who being an Idumean born, and a stranger to the stock and kindred of the Jews, and yet coveting much to be taken for a Jew, to the end he might establish to him and his posterity the kingdom of that country, which he had gotten of Augustus Cæsar, he commanded all the genealogies and pedigrees to be burnt, and made out of the way, so that there should remain no record whereby it might be known to them that came after, that he was an alien in blood: whereas even from Abraham's time these monuments had been safely kept amongst the Jews, and laid up in their treasury: because in them it might easily and most assuredly be found, of what lineage every one did descend. So (in good faith) do these men, when they would have all their own doings in estimation, as though they had been delivered to us even from the apostles, or from Christ himself:

[Vol. iv. p. 55.]

Euseb. lib. 1.
cap. 7, 8. [i.
24.]

to the end there might be found nowhere any thing able to convince such their dreams and lies, either they burn the *holy scriptures*, or else they craftily convey them from the people.

M. HARDING.

All this is M. Harding's sobriety: it is no railing.

Pardon me, I pray thee, reader, if I use words somewhat vehement, the cause so requiring.....

a Untruth. For the old Latin text hath infinite corruptions.

b Untruth. Otherwise let M. Harding shew one point of corruption.

c But he is a foolish man that burneth down both the trees and caterpillars all together.

d You had it in your libraries, but the poor people had it not.

This defender crieth out, O ye pillars of religion! But how much more justly cry we again to him, O thou captain-liar! O most worthy, not the reward of a whetstone, but the judgment of a backbiter, of a slanderer, of a cursed speaker, of a mocker, of the accuser of the brethren, of a blasphemer! Is this the regard thou hast, I say not to God, or to Christian men, but to thine own estimation, and common honesty of a man? Canst thou persuade thyself to get credit by lying, to seem sober by railing, honest by villainy, charitable by slandering, upright by deceit, just by impiety? Why sayest thou of us in general, that is to say, of the catholic church, that we despise, hate, cast away, and burn the holy scriptures? Had we not loved and kept the scriptures, how couldst thou and thy fellows have come by them? Had ye not them of us? From the apostles' time to this day we have kept them ^a unspotted and undefiled: and ye within these fifty years have by your vulgar translations ^b corrupted them, that lamentable it is to consider. And when we burned the same corrupt translations, or any part thereof, or any of your heretical treatises, we burned not the scriptures, ^c no more than one doth the apple tree, that burneth the caterpillars.

The scriptures we honour, and keep most reverently and diligently. Therefore your comparing of us with the wicked kings Aza, Antiochus, Maximinus, and Herod, is false and slanderous. For how say you, sir captain of liars, ^d had we not the scripture in every monastery, cathedral church, college, in every private library of any that was learned ^{e7}?.....

The like thing was objected to St. Augustine and the catholics in his time by the Donatists, being then heretics, as ye are now. To whom he answereth, as we will answer you: *Certe ille ignibus tradidisse credatur, qui eis lectis non consentire convincitur*: "Let him be thought to have cast the holy scriptures into the fire, who, when they are read, is convict not to consent unto

[August. de Unit. Eccl. ix. 341.]

^{e7} [Harding adds, "Doth it not appear to you how little the catholics sticked at costs and charges, to be furnished with store of fair written Bibles? If printing were

as costly now as handwriting was then, is it to be thought ye would of yourselves have been so well stored with these holy books as they were?"]

them." We read in the holy scriptures, that Christ said, "This is my body." Who believeth it, ye ^e that deny it, or we who are content to die for the defence of that his real body in the blessed sacrament? St. James saith: "A man is justified by works, and not by faith only." Who believeth this, they which say, that only faith justifieth, or they which say that works be required also to justification? Christ saith: ^f *Qui manducat hunc panem, vivet in eternum*: "He that eateth this bread shall live for ever." ^f Who believeth this, they that say both kinds be necessary to laymen by commandment of Christ, or they who say, that one kind is sufficient to salvation concerning the eating of the sacrament?.....

^e Untruth.
For we deny it not.

^f A worthy argument, and full wisely applied.
Read the answer.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Ye may soon be pardoned, M. Harding, for speaking ill: forasmuch as, for aught that may appear by your speech, ye have not yet learned to speak well. Whether ye have burnt the scriptures of God, or no, both heaven, and earth, and sea, and land, may bear witness. For a poor excuse ye say, "ye have burnt our errors, and heretical translations, and not the scriptures: as the husbandman useth to burn the caterpillars." Howbeit, he may be thought an unwise husbandman, that burneth up his caterpillars, and trees too, both together: and to wreak himself of the one, is content to destroy the other. If all books containing error should be burnt, then should your *Lovanian novelties* go to wrack. For yewis, M. Harding, contention and vainglory set apart, ye know right well, they are full of errors. Moreover ye know there be errors in St. Augustine, there be errors in Origen, in Tertullian, in St. Ambrose, in St. Hierom: there be errors in every of the ancient fathers: in the Greeks: in the Latins: in one and other. There be errors in your *school doctors*: there be errors in your *canonists*. Briefly, your *holy fathers' decrees and decretals* are not void of errors. Yet is there no book worthy to be burnt, in respect of error, but only the book of the scriptures?

If there were such errors in the *vulgar translations*, ye should have descried them, although not all, yet for your credit's sake, one at the least. Ye should have removed the error, and have restored the scriptures to the use and

comfort of the people. But this is it that troubleth you so sore, that the *scriptures* are published in the common known tongues, and that the simple people of all sorts (whom otherwise ye call *dogs*, and *swine*, and filthy *brute beasts*, void of reason) may understand them. This, M. Harding, is that great and horrible *error*: this is the *error* of all *errors*. Therefore Irenæus saith, as it is alleged before: *Hæretici, cum ex scripturis arguuntur, in accusationem vertuntur* [suppl. *ipsarum*] *scripturarum*: “Here-tics, when they be reproved by the scriptures, then begin they to find fault with the scriptures.” And therefore St. Ambrose saith: *Herodes conscius ignobilitatis suæ, scripturas incendit, ne qua posteris suis, vel de præscripto veteri, quæstio moveretur: existimans, quod si judicia de publico sustulisset, nullis aliis testimoniis clarere posset, quin de patriarcharum et proselytorum veterum genere emanaret*: “King Herod, for that he well understood the baseness of his house, therefore he burnt the scriptures; lest that, by mean of such ancient records, some doubt might afterward be moved against his posterity. For he thought, if he had once removed such monuments, it could never be proved by any manner other witness, but that he came by descent from the stock of the *patriarchs* and old proselytes.” whereas indeed he was a mere alien, and a stranger to the *house of Israel*, and a very tyrannous usurper of the crown, as being lineally descended, not from Jacob, but from Esau.

But ye say: “You have kept and preserved the scrip-tures in your libraries, in vellum,” and, I trow, in letters of gold. Even in like sort, and with like truth ye might say, that you have kept the *sun* and the *moon*; and had it not been for your keeping, they had been lost. It was God, M. Harding, that of his mercy preserved his *holy word*: even as he preserved Daniel in the cave of lions; Jonas in the whale’s belly; the *three children* in the midst of the flaming fire. Ye keep the *scriptures*, as the dog keepeth the hay: which neither eateth it himself, nor suffereth the poor hungry cattle, that fain would eat it: ye keep them in ward, in dust and mould, as the Jews, before

M. Harding,
Answer, Art.
15. fol. 155. b.

Iren. lib. 1. c.
1. [p. 174.]

Ambros. in
Luc. lib. 3. c.
3. [l. 1329.]

the time of king Josias, kept the book of Deuteronomy ^{2 Kings xxii. 8.} closely in the corners, or amongst the treasures of the temple, so that no man knew where to find it. Had it not been for God's special providence, notwithstanding your keeping, they might have perished.

St. Chrysostom saith: *Nunc neque an sint scripturæ, quidam sciunt: Spiritus tamen ita dispensavit, ut custodiantur*: "Nowadays there are some that cannot tell, whether there be any scriptures or no. Yet hath the Spirit of God so provided, that they are still preserved ^{88.}"

Thus the Jews made their vaunts, that they were the *keepers of the law*, and that the Christians had all of them. St. Augustine saith: *Judæi dicunt, non nostra nos lege uti, sed sua*: "The Jews say, that we have no law of our own, but only theirs ^{89.}" Likewise even at this day the Jews keep and use the *law of God* with all reverence: they never lay any other book upon the Bible: they wash their hands before they touch it: they will not sit upon the bench where the Bible lieth: as often as they either open it or shut it, they use to kiss it: when the *pope* goeth through Rome to his palace of Lateran, the Jews meet him upon the way, and offer him the Bible, and desire him reverently to embrace it, as though the pope could have no Bible but only of them. All these things notwithstanding, the *pope* answereth them of course, even as we may answer you: *Sanctam legem, viri Hebræi, et laudamus, et veneramur: observantiam vero vestram, et vanam interpretationem damnamus, et improbamus*: "Ye men of the *Jews' profession*, we praise and honour the *holy law*: but your *tradition* and vain *interpretation* we utterly condemn and reprove."

For Chrysostom saith: *Nihil (nunc) apud Judæos [suppl. de lege] remansit, nisi sola scriptura librorum, omni legis observantia pereunte*: "There remaineth now nothing among the Jews, but only the writing contained in books,

⁸⁸ [St. Chrysost. Νῦν δὲ οὐδὲ μῆσεν, ὥστε αὐτὰς φυλαχθῆναι.]
ὅτι γραφαὶ εἰσιν ἰσασί τινες. καίτοι ⁸⁹ [These "Quæstiones" are not
τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τοσαῦτα ὀκονό- genuine.]

Chrysost. in
Epist. ad He-
bræos, hom.
8. [xii. 89.]

Augustin. in
Quest. ex
Vet. Test.
quest. 44.
[iii. app. 57.]

Paul. Phagius
in Deut. cap.
17.

Ceremon. lib.
1. cap. 8. [fol.
39. b.]

Chrysost. in
Matt. hom.
31. in opere
imperfecto.
[vi. app. 132.]

for all the observation of the law is past from them."

Chrysost. in
Genesim,
hom. 8, [tom.
iv. 59.]

Again he saith: *Literæ quidem legis apud illos sunt: sensus autem est apud nos*: "The letters of the law are with the Jews: but the sense and meaning is with us." Like-

wise he saith unto the Jews: *Vos complicatis membranas animalium mortuorum: nos possidemus Spiritum vivificantem*: "You turn the leaves of the scriptures, made of the skins of dead cattle: but we have the Spirit that giveth life." So saith St. Augustine: *Judæi in libris suffragatores nostri sunt: in cordibus hostes nostri*: "The Jews

Augustin. de
Fide rerum
invisibil. cap.
6, [vi. 148.]

help us, and aid us with their books: but they are our enemies in their hearts." Again he saith: *Magnum ali-*

August. con-
tra Faustum
Manich. lib.
16. cap. 21.
[viii. 295.]

quid actum est in usum nostrum de infidelitate Judæorum: ut iidem ipsi, qui hæc propter se non haberent in cordibus, ea propter nos haberent in codicibus: "Some great good thing is wrought to our use by the infidelity of the Jews, that they that, to do themselves good, had not these things in their hearts, yet for our sakes, to do us good, should have the same things in their books."

Speak not therefore so much, M. Harding, of your *safe keeping of the scriptures*. For the Jews have kept, and until this day do keep them as *safely* as you. Ye kept the scriptures as the *augures of Rome* sometime kept the *Sibyls' books*: that is to say, ye kept them to yourselves, in close prison and in secrecy; that the people should know nothing, but in all cases should be forced to seek to you. Thus ye kept the light in darkness: and, as St. Paul saith, ye kept the *truth of God in wickedness*.

Rom. i. 18.

Chrysost. in
Matt. [op.
imp.] hom.
35. [vi. app.
149.]

St. Chrysostom saith: *Quando vides scripturas prophetarum, et evangelii, et apostolorum traditas esse in manus falsorum sacerdotum,.....num intelligis, quod verbum veritatis traditum est principibus iniquis, et scribis?* "When thou seest the scriptures of the prophets, of the gospel, and of the apostles to be delivered into the hands of false priests, dost thou not understand, that the word of truth is delivered unto the wicked princes and unto the scribes?"

Chrysost. in
1 Cor. hom.
36. [x. 339.
19.]

To be short, I may answer you with the words of Chrysostom: *Arcas et scrinia rerum pretiosissimarum adhuc*

servatis, thesauro destituti: "Ye keep still the chests and boxes of most precious things: but the jewels and treasures be clean gone⁸⁹." Therefore, your *safe keeping* of the *scriptures* notwithstanding, we may say to you, as St. Augustine sometime said to the heretic Petilian⁹⁰: *Judas* August. contra Literas Petilian. lib. 2. cap. 8. [1x. 221.] *Christum carnalem tradidit: tu spiritualem* [al. *spirituali-*]: *furens evangelium sanctum flammis sacrilegis tradi-* *disti*: "Judas betrayed *Christ carnal*: thou hast betrayed *Christ spiritual*: for thou in thy rage hast delivered the *holy gospels* unto wicked fires."

Ye reply, "You rather have burnt the gospel, for that you deny the words of the gospel." For example, ye allege these words of Christ, "*This is my body*:" which words (ye say) of our part are denied. God be thanked, as we have not burnt, so have we not denied any word or parcel of the gospel. Touching these words by you alleged, we embrace them, and reverence them, and believe them, even as the *words of Christ*. But we embrace them, not as you have fondly racked and wrested them, and foully abused them, by your vain constructions; but as Christ meant them, and as the ancient catholic fathers in the old times have expounded them. St. Chrysostom saith: *Sacræ scripturæ verba non vult Deus, ut simpliciter, sed multa cum prudentia intelligantur*: "God will not that we should understand the *words of the holy scripture* simply and plainly as they lie, but with great wisdom and discretion⁹¹." Again he saith: *Diligenter invigilandum est: vel potius divina gratia opus est, ne nudis verbis* Chrysost. in Johan. hom. 14. [viii. 84.] *insistamus. Ita hæretici in errorem incidunt*: "We must take great heed: or rather we have need of the grace

⁸⁹ [St. Chrysost. in 1 Corinth. Ἄλλ' ὅκειν ἡ ἐκκλησία νῦν γυναικὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς εὐημερίας ἐκπεσοῦσθ, καὶ τὰ σύμβολα κατεχοῦσθ πολλὰ χροῦ μόνον τῆς ἀρχαίας εὐπραγίας ἐκείνης, καὶ τὰς μέν θήκας τῶν χρυσίων ἐπιδεικνυμένη καὶ τὰ κιβώτια, τὸν δὲ πλοῦτον ἀφηρημένη.]

⁹⁰ [Bishop Jewel has here made a remarkable mistake. These are

Petilian's words to St. Augustine; who afterwards disclaims the sacrilege imputed to him of burning the scriptures.]

⁹¹ [St. Chrysost. in Johan. τῶν ὀνομάτων καὶ τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς κειμένων, οὐχ ἀπλῶς ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς ἐπακούειν βούλεται, ἀλλὰ μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς συνέσεως.]

of God, that we rest not upon the *bare words of the scriptures*. For by that means heretics fall into error." St. Augustine saith: *Omne figurate, aut factum, aut dictum, hoc enuntiat, quod significat*: "Every thing that is either done or spoken in a *figure*, sheweth forth the same thing that it *signifieth* ⁹²." St. Hierom saith: *Ne putemus in verbis scripturarum esse evangelium, sed in sensu*: "Let us not think that the gospel standeth in the *words of the scripture*, but in the meaning."

Augustin. ad
Consentium,
lib. 1. c. 10.
contr. men-
dacium. [vi.
462.]
Hieron. ad
Gal. cap. 1.
[iv. p. 230.]

Hier. in Mat.
cap. 16. [iv.
75.]

Again he saith: *Cum seniores putentur in ecclesiis, et principes sacerdotum, simplicem sequentes literam, occidunt Filium Dei*: "Whereas they be taken for the elders of the church, and the chief of the priests, following the plain letter," (as it is written, and not regarding the meaning) "they kill the Son of God."

Let us see, therefore, in what sense the holy catholic fathers have in old times expounded these words of Christ: "*This is my body.*"

Tertull. con-
tra Marcion.
lib. 4. [c. 40.
pp. 457. 458.]

First, Tertullian saith thus: *Christus acceptum panem, et distributum discipulis, corpus suum illum fecit dicendo: Hoc est corpus meum, hoc* [leg. *id*] *est, figura corporis mei*: "Christ, taking the bread and dividing it to his disciples, made it his body, saying, '*This is my body,*' that is to say, *This is a figure of my body.*" St. Augustine saith: *Non dubitavit Dominus dicere, Hoc est corpus meum, cum daret signum corporis sui*: "Our Lord doubted not to say, '*This is my body,*' when he gave a token of his body." I leave infinite other authorities to like purpose. By these few we may easily perceive in what sense the holy fathers in old time understood these words of Christ, "*This is my body.*" Yet were they never therefore condemned of *heresy*, nor thought to deny any parcel of the scriptures.

August. con-
tra Adiman.
cap. 12. [viii.
124.]

August. in
Quest. in
Levit. qu. 57.
[lii. 516.]

St. Augustine saith: *Solet res, quæ significat, ejus rei nomine, quam significat, nuncupari:..... Hinc est, quod dictum est, Petra erat Christus. Non enim dicit, Petra significat Christum: sed tanquam hoc esset, quod utique*

⁹² [There is a passage resembling this in the place referred to.]

per substantiam non erat, sed per significationem: "The thing that signifieth is commonly called by the name of that thing that it signifieth. Therefore is it that St. Paul saith: '*The Rock was Christ.*' For he saith not, *The Rock signified Christ*, (but, '*The Rock was Christ,*') as if the Rock had been Christ indeed, whereas touching the substance it was not so, but so it was by signification."

In this sort is the *bread, Christ's body*: not verily and indeed: but, as St. Augustine saith, after a certain phrase or manner of speech. And so is it noted even in your own Glosses: *Vocatur corpus Christi, id est, Significat corpus Christi*: "The bread is called the body of Christ: De Con. dist. 2. Hoc est. In Gloss. that is to say, *The bread signifieth the body of Christ.*" Thus we deny not Christ's words, M. Harding: but we deny the fond and fantastical senses that you have imagined of *Christ's words*. Therefore where you allege these words, as spoken by St. Augustine, "He is a burner of the scriptures that consenteth not unto the scriptures," ye might have remembered, that the same St. Augustine likewise saith: *Ille credatur testamentum tradidisse flammis, qui contra voluntatem litigat testatoris*: "He is to be thought to have delivered the testament to the fire, that quarrelleth" (as you do) "against the will and meaning of him that made the testament." St. Gregory saith: *Facile in verbis [suppl. ejus] agnoscimus aliud esse, quod intimant, aliud, quod sonant: tanto autem quisque notitiæ illius extraneus redditur, quanto in sola ejus superficie ligatur*: "In words we do well perceive that there is one thing that they signify, and another thing that they sound. And the more a man bindeth himself to the outward sight and show of the letter, the further off is he from the understanding of the same."

The objection of difference that ye make between St. James and St. Paul, (St. Augustine saith) is made by them that understand neither St. James nor St. Paul. The whole force thereof is answered before. It is easy to see that St. Paul speaketh of one kind of *works*, and St. James of another: and again, St. Paul of one kind of *justification*, Aug. in lib. 83. Quest. qu. 76. [vi. 68.] Part. i. cap. 10. divis. 1. [sup. vol. iv. p. 299.]

and St. James of another. Therefore this difference is soon avoided. Certainly we deny neither St. Paul nor St. James, nor think the one of them to be contrary to the other.

John vi. 51. Touching the words of Christ that ye have alleged out of St. John, it appeareth ye were in some haste, and therefore were fain to take that came first to hand. For I will not say, M. Harding, what doctor or father, but what drift or discretion of common sense ever taught you to reason thus. Christ saith: "*He that eateth of this bread shall live for ever.*" Ergo, The people must receive the communion under one kind? Who ever taught you thus to reason? Eckius your fellow reasoneth with like discretion to like purpose:

Kemnitius in
Examln.
Conc. Trid.
p. 598. [pt. 2.
p. 116.]

"Give us," saith he, "*our daily bread.*"

Ergo, *We may restrain the people from the cup.*

Perhaps ye will say, The name of *bread* belongeth to eating only, and not to drinking. This may be granted well without prejudice. Notwithstanding St. Cyprian doubted not to say: *Manducaverunt et biberunt de eodem pane*: "They did both eat and drink of one bread." And again he saith: *Manducamus et bibimus ejus sanguinem*: "*We eat and drink his blood.*" Here have you both *drinking of bread*, and *eating of blood*.

Cypr. [I. Arnoldi] de
Cena Domini. [App. ex.]
In eod. serm.

Howbeit, indeed these words of Christ in the sixth of St. John belong only to the *spiritual eating* and drinking of Christ's body and blood, (that is wrought, not by the mouth, but only by faith,) and nothing to the outward ministration of the sacrament. One of your own doctors saith: *Hæc verba nihil directe pertinent ad sacramentalem, vel corporalem manducationem. Nam hoc verbum dictum [suppl. diu] fuit, antequam sacramentum eucharistiæ esset institutum. Ex illa igitur litera de sacramentali communione non potest fieri argumentum efficax*: "These words of Christ in the sixth chapter of St. John directly pertain nothing to the sacramental or corporal eating. For these words were spoken long before the *sacrament* was ordained. Therefore of this place there can be made no

Nicolaus Lyra, in Ps. cx.
[iii. 1300.]

good sufficient argument touching the sacramental communion⁹³." You say, your proof, taken of these words, is sufficient, and therewith ye deceive the ignorant. Your own doctor saith: "*It is not sufficient.*" Now let your indifferent reader judge, whether of you two is deceived.

And, whereas ye would seem to say, Christ gave no commandment of *both kinds* to be received of the people, even so, and with like truth, ye might also say, *Christ gave no commandment, no not of one kind at all to be received of the people.* For there was no man present, but only the apostles, at the institution, as well of the one kind as of the other. Therefore that the people may claim any one part of the sacrament, they have it not of any right, but only of your mere and free liberality. For otherwise of duty, by your judgment, they should have nothing.

Notwithstanding Christ saith: *Bibite ex hoc omnes*: "Drink ye" (not only the apostles, but) "drink ye all of this." Which words Paschasius expoundeth thus: *Bibite ex hoc omnes, hoc est, tam ministri, quam reliqui credentes*: "Drink ye all of this: that is to say, as well the ministers, as the rest of the faithful." Another saith thus: *Bibite ex hoc omnes: omnes, scilicet, sine personarum acceptione*: "Drink ye all of this: *all*, that is to say, without difference or choice of persons." Paschasius. [cap. 15.]

But hereof we have spoken more at large in other places. Gloss. Citatur a Cassandro, de utraque Specie. [p. 1043.]

[Vol. iv. p. 55.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 21. *Divis. 2 and 3.*

Very rightly and aptly doth Chrysostom write against these men. "Heretics," saith he, "shut up the gates against the truth: for they know full well, if the gate were open, the church should be none of theirs⁹⁴." [Chrysost. in Oper. imperf. tom. vi. App. p. 186.]

Theophylact also: "*God's word*," saith he, "*is the candle, whereby the thief is espied*⁹⁵." [Theophyl. in Luc. xvi. 31.]

⁹³ [Supra vol. v. p. 251, where bishop Jewel owns his error in attributing these words to Lyra instead of Döring.]

⁹⁴ [Harding's answer is omitted, as containing nothing worth notice.]

⁹⁵ [Supra vol. iii. 284, note 5.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 21. Divis. 4.

[Tertull. {leg.
Novatian.} de
Trinit. ad
calc. Tertull.
p. 718.]

And Tertullian ⁹⁶ saith: "The *holy scripture manifestly findeth out the fraud and theft of heretics.*" [Vol. iv. p. 55.]

For why do they hide, why do they keep under the gospel, which Christ would have preached aloud from the house top? Why whelm they that light under a bushel, which ought to stand on the candlestick?

M. HARDING.

a This chastity in the more part is open filthiness. They forbid marriage, and suffer concubines for the better mean to serve God.

.....The scripture saith: "There shall be men standing in ^a Tim. iii. their own conceit; unchaste, loving pleasure more than God."... Who are unchaste? They that exhort all men to ^a chastity, and themselves abstain from wedlock for the better mean to serve God: or ye, that bid men which have vowed chastity, to break their vows?.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Matt. xxlii.
27.

I leave your *chastity* to the judgment of the world. Yet you may remember, there were some in old times whom Christ likened to *painted graves*: outwardly in appearance fair and glorious; but inwardly full of stinking bones. It appeareth by the whole course and order of your lives, that *single life* and *chastity* are sundry things. St. Hierom saith thus: *Super concupiscentiam fœminarum non intelliget: de Antichristo facilius interpretatio est: quod ideo simulet castitatem, ut plurimos decipiat*: "He shall have no skill touching the desire of women: the better exposition hereof is to apply these words to Antichrist: for that he shall *counterfeit chastity*, to the end to deceive many."

Hieron. in
Daniel. 6p.
11. [iii. 1131.]

Aug. de Mo-
ribus Eccles.
Cathol. lib. 1.
cap. 1. [i.
687.]
Ambros. de
Noë et Arca,
cap. 14. [i.
248.]

St. Augustine saith of the heretics called the Manichees: *Vitæ castæ, et memorabilis continentie imaginem præferunt*: "They bear a countenance of continent life and notable chastity." St. Ambrose saith: *Multi sunt hæreticorum, qui prætereendere volunt corporis continentiam*: "There be many heretics, that will counterfeit and

⁹⁶ [Tertullian: supra vol. iii. p. 308: and vol. i. p. 135.]

pretend *chastity of body*, (that by the witness thereof they may win credit to their doctrine.)” Therefore, M. Harding, when you thus vaunt yourselves of this colour of *chastity*, ye make boast of that thing that other *heretics* and *Antichrist* himself shall have, as well as you.

St. Paul, where he foretelleth us of the *disciples of Antichrist*, amongst other marks whereby they may be known, saith thus: *Prohibentes nubere*: whereby he meant, that *Antichrist* should give out a great shine of *chaste life*, and forbid *marriage*. Of such St. Hierom saith: *Jactant pudicitiam suam impudenti facie*: “They make brags of their chastity with whorish countenance ^{97.}” Hieron. in Hierem. cap. 7. lib. 2. [iii. 565.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 21. *Divis. 5 and 6.*

[Vol. iv. p. 56.]

Why trust they more to the blindness of the unskilful multitude, and to ignorance, than to the goodness of their cause?

Think they, their sleights are not already perceived, and that they can walk now unespied, as though they had *Gyges’* ring to go invisible by upon their finger? No, no ^{98.}

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 21. *Divis. 7.*

[Vol. iv. p. 56.]

All men see now well and well again, what good stuff is in that chest of the *bishop of Rome’s bosom*. This thing alone of itself may be an argument sufficient, that they work not uprightly and truly. [In 6to. de Constitut. Licet Roman.]

M. HARDING.

You are much troubled with the chest of the pope’s bosom, wherein he is thought to have all laws. At this you scoff four or five times in your Apology, meddling with a matter that you understand not. For it is a lawyer’s phrase: who presupposeth the prince of every commonweal to know the law of the same,

⁹⁷ [S. Hieron. “Jactant pudicitiam et impudenti vultu præferunt castitatem.”] over Harding’s “unnecessary and waste words,” according to his intention expressed supra vol. iv.

⁹⁸ [Bishop Jewel here passes p. 142.]

no less than if it were written in his breast. And therefore when he maketh a new law, he repealeth the former law, whereunto the latter is contrary.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Forasmuch as this matter of the *pope's breast* is so deep and full of darkness, specially being, as you say, a *lawyer's phrase*, that no man may safely enter into it, but only you, that never were student in any *law*, let us therefore see what your own *canonists* and *lawyers* themselves have meant hereby⁹⁹.

Baldus, 1.
cap. Colla,
ultima. De
Confess.

First of all, Baldus of Perusium saith: *Papa est doctor utriusque juris, autoritate, non scientia*: "The pope is doctor of both laws," (as well *civil* as *canon*), "by authority, but not by knowledge." Here we find, howsoever the *pope* be stored of learning, yet at the least he is a *doctor* by authority, and that a doctor of *both laws*. So easy a matter it is to fill his *breast*.

9 Qu. 3. Ne-
que ab Au-
gust. [l. Ne-
mo.]

[In 6to. de
Const. Licet
Roman.]

Dist. 19. Si
Romanorum.
In Gloss.

Dist. 40. Si
Papa. In
Glossa.

[Dist. 19.
Nulli: in
Glossa.]

[Dist. 40.
Non nos: in
Glossa.]

Further your Gloss saith: *Etsi [leg. si] totus mundus sententiaret in aliquo negotio contra papam, tamen videtur, quod standum sit [leg. esset] sententiæ papæ.*—*Jura enim omnia in scrinio pectoris sui habere videtur.*—*Quod ergo papa approbat, vel reprobat, et nos approbare, vel reprobare debemus.*—*Quisquis ergo non obedit statutis Romanæ ecclesiæ, hæreticus est censendus.*—*Et sacrilegii instar esset, disputare de facto papæ*: "Although all the world would judge in any matter against the *pope*, yet it seemeth we ought to stand to the judgment of the *pope*. For he seemeth to have *all laws in the chest* of his bosom: therefore, whatsoever the *pope* either alloweth or disalloweth, we are bound likewise to allow or disallow the same. And whosoever is not obedient to the laws of the church of Rome must be deemed an heretic. And it were as great sin as church-robbing to reason of any of the *pope's* doings."

Extr. de
transl. Episc.
Quanto: in
Glossa. [lib.
1, tit. 7. c. 3.
E.]

Further, your *lawyers* say thus: *Papa dicitur habere celeste arbitrium: unde in his quæ vult, est ei pro ratione voluntas. Nec est, qui dicat illi, (Domine,) cur ita facis?*

⁹⁹ [Supra vol. ii. p. 316, and vol. v. p. 268, there are many more authorities to the same purport.]

—*Quia sicut ex sola voluntate potest per papam lex creari, ita per solam voluntatem potest cum ea dispensari*: “The pope is said to have a heavenly judgment: therefore in such things as he willeth, his will standeth instead of reason. Neither may any man say unto him, O sir, *why do you thus?* Like as a *law* may be made by the *only will of the pope*: so may the same *law* be dispensed withal *only by the will of the pope*.”

Felln. De Re-
scriptis. Ad
audientiam.
2. ver. [lib. 1.
tit. 3. cap. 31.
tom. 1. fol.
160.]

This, M. Harding, is the exposition of your *lawyer's phrase*. These are the treasures that we are taught to seek in the closet of the *pope's breast*. Thus may we set apart scriptures, doctors, councils, and whatsoever is beside. The *pope's breast* may serve for all.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 21. Divis. 8.

Worthily ought that matter seem suspicious, which flieth trial, and is afraid of the light. “*For he that doth evil,*” as Christ saith, “*seeketh darkness, and hateth the light.*” *A conscience that knoweth itself clear, cometh willingly into open shew, that the works which proceed of God may be seen.* Neither be they so very blind, but they see this well enough, that their kingdom straightway is at a point, if the scriptures once have the upper hand: and that, like as men say, the idols of devils in times past, of whom men in doubtful matters were then wont to receive answers, were suddenly stricken dumb at the sight of Christ, when he was born, and came into the world: even so they see, that now all their subtle practices will soon fall down headlong, even upon the sight of the gospel. For *Antichrist* is not overthrown but by the brightness of the coming of *Christ*¹.

¹ [Here follows a page of Harding's “talk” about the council of Trent not being attended by the protestants.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 22. *Divis.* 1.

As for us, we run not for succour to the fire, as these men's guise is, but we run to the scriptures: neither do we reason² with the sword, but with the word of God: and therewith, as saith Tertullian, *do we feed our faith: by it do we stir up our hope, and strengthen our confidence.*

[Tertull. A-
pologet. c.
39. p. 31.]

M. HARDING.

All this now
is extreme
cruelty: not
long sithence
it had been
taken for
great mercy.

"Ye fly not to the fire, as we do," say ye, "but unto the scriptures. Neither do ye reason with us with the sword, but with the word of God." Ah, good word of God, thou servest to many purposes. And is it indeed the word of God, sirs, that keepeth so many reverend fathers in prison these many years? Is it the word of God that hath deprived so many men, some of their livings, some of their countries, whose life ye cannot blame? Is it the word of God that by cruelty of imprisonment of late years gave most certain occasion of death to those holy, learned, and worshipful men, who for their singular virtue being well known, need not here to be named? Is it the word of God that made so much ado in your late parliament for establishing of your bloody law, whereby ye would have power to put men to death^a for the faith of Christendom? The Turks and Saracens have always suffered them to live in their dominions, but our gospellers, by their word of God, are taught to kill them. Blessed be God, who hath given to our noble and most clement queen Elizabeth a better spirit to understand his word in this point, ^b than these gospellers have yet attained unto³.....

^a Untruth.
For it is ei-
ther idolatry
or open folly,
and no part
of the faith
of Christen-
dom.

^b What spi-
rit then had
you, M. Hard-
ing, and your
fellows, that
burnt so
many?

^c This mat-
ter, thus ut-
tered in ge-
nerality, is a
great un-
truth.

If any of you do say, that the new superintendents do not keep the old bishops and learned clergy in prison, but the law of the realm; I answer, first, that the law is a crab of your own stock: next, that neither the bishops beforetime burnt heretics, but the law of the realm, the law of the prince, the law of all Christendom. Neither was the same made by papists of late years, as ye would your deceived disciples to believe, but of old time thought necessary by princes to be enacted, for the better maintenance of quiet in their dominions.....

² [Apol. Lat. "obsidemus."]

³ [Here is an allusion to an in-
stance of a dog and dragon put up

instead of the Virgin Mary, and
St. John the evangelist on either
side of the crucifix.]

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

“It is no new practice,” ye say, “to kill heretics.” I grant you. Neither is it a new practice to condemn godly men by the name of *heretics*. Your fathers sometime cried out against *Christ the Son of God*, “*We have a law: and by the law he ought to die.*” And Christ himself said sometime to Jerusalem, the city of blood, “*O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killest the prophets, and stonest them to death that be sent unto thee.*” But St. Augustine saith: *Nullis bonis in catholica hoc placet, si usque ad mortem in quenquam, licet hæreticum, sæviatur*: “It seemeth good unto no good man in the catholic church, that cruelty unto death be shewed unto any man, no though he be an *heretic*.” John xix. 7. Luke xiii. 34. August. contra Crescon. Gram. lib. 3. cap. 50. [ix. 463.]

Notwithstanding, it agreeth well with your religion, M. Harding, though your mouths now be muffled, yet to ramp and gape still after blood. Fulfil ye the measure of your fathers. Let it not grieve you to hear what Solomon saith: *Viscera impiorum crudelia*: “The very bowels of the wicked are full of cruelty.” When your fables and follies be espied, then ye flee to sword and fire. Which being once wrested from you, your whole religion must needs come to ground. St. Hierom saith of other your peers: *Pugnant epicherematis ex carnificum officinis*: “They fight with arguments taken from the butchers’ shops.” Matt. xxiii. 32. Prov. xii. 10.

Ye have wreaked your anger long enough upon innocent blood. Begin once to know the hand of God. It is hard for you to kick still against the prick. We may truly say unto you with St. Cyprian: *Sacerdos Dei evangelium tenens, et Christi præcepta custodiens, occidi potest, vinci non potest*: “The priest of God holding the gospel, and keeping the commandments of Christ, may well be killed, but conquered he cannot be.” We may say with Tertullian: *Crudelitas vestra, gloria nostra est:—plures effici-mur, quoties metimur a vobis*: “Your cruelty is our glory. When ye come to reckon us⁴, ye find us mo and mo.” Cyprian. ad Cornel. [p. 88.] Tertull. in Scapulam. [p. 71.] Tertull. in Apologetico. [sub fin. p. 40.]

⁴ [Rather, “As often as we are mown down, or reaped.”]

1 Esdr. iv. 35. *Truth above all things will prevail.*—*There is no counsel*
[vulg.]
Prov. xxi. 30. *against the Lord.*

As for our part, we were never yet guilty to one drop of your blood. We seek no aid at *fire* or *sword*. We will rather say with St. Hierom: *Utinam filios hæreticorum, et omnium, qui decepti sunt, interficiamus sagittis spiritualibus, id est, testimoniis scripturarum*: “Would God, we may rather kill the children of heretics, and of all them that be deceived, with spiritual arrows, that is to say, with the testimonies of the scriptures.” And with St. Augustine: *O si occidas eos de gladio bis acuto, et non sint hostes tui: sic enim amo eos occidi sibi, ut vivant tibi*: “Would God, thou wouldest kill them, O Lord, with the two-edged sword,” (that is, with thy holy word,) “that they may no longer be thine enemies: for so I wish them to be killed unto themselves, that they may live unto thee.” And again: *Vindictet nos Deus de vobis, ut ipsum errorem vestrum in vobis occidat, et nobiscum de veritate gaudeatis*: “God so revenge our cause against you, that he may kill your error in you, that ye may rejoice together with us of the truth.” This, M. Harding, this is the revenge that we seek upon you, as this day it may appear.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 22. *Divis. 2.*

Rom. i. 16. For we know that the gospel of Jesus Christ *is* [Vol. iv. p. 56.]
the power of God unto salvation, and that therein consisteth eternal life. And as Paul warneth us,
Gal. i. 8. *we do not hear, no not an angel of God, though he come from heaven, if he go about to pull us from any part of this doctrine*⁴.

⁴ [In the Latin Apol. the following words occur, which are totally omitted in the English translation adopted in the second edition of the Defence of 1570, though they are found in the first edition: “Immo ut vir sanctissimus Justinus Martyr de se loquitur, Ne Deo quidem ipsi fidem

“haberemus, si aliud nos doceret “evangelium.” No reference is furnished to the part of St. Justin, where this extraordinary sentence is to be found. It is probable that bishop Jewel omitted it in the second edition, on finding that he could not verify the reference.]

M. HARDING.

Boast no more of the gospel. We (I mean the catholic church) had it, we kept it and understood it, before ye were born, and before your heresy was heard of....

But a devil coming from hell (for who is author of division but Satan?) hath carried you away into another gospel: whereas indeed there is but one true gospel. And here let any indifferent man consider, how uprightly you allege St. Paul. You write, that Paul warneth you not to give ear to an angel coming from heaven, if he go about to draw you from any part of this doctrine. Of which this doctrine mean you? Of this, which you have declared in this Apology? ^a Did St. Paul ever read your Apology? How then pronounced he of it that sentence? "We mean" (say you) "by this doctrine the doctrine of the gospel." If you mean so, we say the same. But we tell you, that St. Paul spake not of every gospel generally, but of a certain gospel qualified. For he saith: *Si quis vobis evangelizaverit præter id quod accepistis, anathema sit*: "If any man preach a gospel unto you, besides that ye have received, be he accursed." Hear you the gospel St. Paul speaketh of? It is not every gospel. It is a gospel preached and received. If ye preach that gospel which ye received, we join hands with you. But if ye preach a gospel which ye have received of no apostle, nor apostolic preacher, and which was not heard of in the earth, when Luther ran out of his cloister and forsook his religion; then be ye assured, that ye are the men, who are holden for accursed of St. Paul.....

^a And did St. Paul ever read your late chapter of Trent?

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here, M. Harding, ye would fain scape away with a childish cavil. "Paul," ye say, "*speaketh of a gospel qualified*:" whereby ye mean a *gospel* delivered and received: as if ye would say, the *gospel* of Christ, unless it be delivered by you, is no *gospel*. But St. Paul meant not the doctrine delivered from hand to hand, or from *pope to pope*: but the doctrine delivered and received in the *scriptures*. And in this sense he saith of himself: *Quod accepi a Domino, hoc et tradidi vobis*: "The thing that I have received of the Lord, the same have I delivered unto you." In like sort he calleth himself an *apostle*, "not of men, nor by men, but by Jesus Christ." Howbeit, what need many words? The case is clear. St. Augustine saith plainly: *Paulus ait, Si angelus de cælo vobis annuntiaverit, præter quam quod in scripturis legalibus, et evangelicis accepistis*, ^{1 Cor. xi. 23.} ^{August. contra literas Petilian. lib. 3. cap. 6. [ix. 301.]}

anathema sit: “If an angel from heaven preach unto you any other thing than ye have received” (not by *tradition*, or by delivery from your elders, but) “in the scriptures of the *law* and of the *gospel*, accursed be he.” These words be plain, M. Harding, and quite disgrace all your *Glosses*.

Chrysost. in
Epist. ad
Gal. cap. i.
[x. 670.]

Hereto Chrysostom addeth further: *Non dixit Paulus, Si contraria annuntiaverint, aut totum evangelium subverterint, verum, Si vel paulum evangelizaverint præter evangelium quod accepistis, etiamsi quidvis labefactaverint, anathema sint*: “St. Paul saith not, If they teach the contrary, or, If they overthrow the whole gospel: but he saith, If they preach any little small thing besides the gospel that ye have received, or if they loose or shake down any thing, whatsoever it be, accursed be they.” These words, M. Harding, touch you very near. Ye have altered the whole form of the church of God. Therefore repent yourselves, lest ye remain still within the danger of the curse.

Aug. de Bono
Viduit. cap. i.
[vi. 369.]
Rom. xii. 3.

St. Augustine saith: *Sancta scriptura nostra doctrinæ regulam figit, ne audeamus plus sapere, quam oporteat sapere*: “The holy scripture hath laid a rule unto our doctrine, that we dare not to understand more than is meet for us to understand.”

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 22. Divis. 3.

For where these men bid the holy scriptures away, as dumb and fruitless, and procure us to come to God himself rather, who speaketh in the church, and in their councils, that is to say, to believe their fancies and opinions, this way of finding out the truth is very uncertain and exceeding dangerous, and in manner a phantastical⁵ and mad way, and by no means allowed of the *holy fathers*.

⁵ [Apol. Lat. “fanatica.”]

M. HARDING.

.....Where they say we pass little on the scriptures, as dumb and unprofitable, therein they ^aslander us, as in other things. We do not so: but we say, that as every act of parliament must be executed by a lawful judge, so the holy scriptures have their execution by lawful judges, who are the bishops and fathers, as well in other places, as specially when they be lawfully assembled in general councils. Now say these men, that way is very uncertain, dangerous, in manner mad, and not allowed of the fathers. Who ever heard men (thought to have their right wits) talk after so loose a sort? Did the fathers ^bdisprove the order of coming together in general councils? or thought they the same to be a way for men to be the sooner deceived? If so many may be deceived with most diligent study and mature judgment conferring together, how much sooner may one or two alone, led by private fancy and self-will, be carried away into error? At the Nicene council came together 318 bishops. At the first of Constantinople, 150. At the Ephesine council, 200. At that of Chalcedon, 630. All these four councils sundry ancient fathers, namely St. Gregory, esteemed as the four gospels.... "Yea but," saith he, "I have the word of God." But what if three hundred far holier and better learned men say, He hath it not. "Let the reader be judge," saith he. A meet judge in such a cause. The scholars may read, but judge of their masters they may not, by Christ's doctrine, who said, *Non est discipulus supra magistrum*: "The scholar is not above his master." "Why not, for all that," say you, "if the Holy Ghost inspire him?" Sir, is it not to be thought God doth assist his church, represented in such solemn assemblies of three hundred or mo fathers, governors of Christian people, rather than one man?

^a Untruth. For these be your own fellows' words. Read the answer.

^b Gregorius Nazianzenus saith, he never saw good come of any council. [ad Procop. ii. 110.]

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Whether ye call the *scriptures* of God a *dumb* thing or no, I report me to that is said before. One of you calleth it, *Mortuum atramentum*: "Dead ink." Another saith: *Scriptura est res inanimis, et muta*: "The scripture is a dead and a dumb thing." Another calleth the *scriptures*, *Nigrum evangelium*: "The black gospel." Now if the *scriptures* be *dead* and *dumb*, and cannot speak, then must it needs follow, they are *unprofitable*. Neither do we despise the authority of *councils*. Good councils be grave, and reverend. But thus we say: Councils are often against councils. And if we make reckoning of number, the Arian heretics have had mo *councils* than the Christians.

Cap. 19. Div. 1. [Supra vol. v. p. 532.]

Ludovicus in Conc. Trid.

Episc. Pictav. in Conc. Trid. [Sleidan. lib. 23.]

Albert. Pigh. Controvers. 3. Eckius.

Hier. in Ep.
ad Galat.

St. Hierom saith: *Spiritus Sancti doctrina est, quæ canonicis literis prodita est: contra quam si quid statuant concilia, nefas duco*: “That is the doctrine of the Holy Ghost that is set abroad in the canonical *scriptures*: against which doctrine if councils determine any thing, *I think it wicked.*”

Chrysost. in
2 ad Timot.
hom. 2. [xl.
669.]

St. Chrysostom saith further in more earnest sort: *Plus aliquid dicam: ne Paulo quidem obedire oportet, si quid dixerit proprium, si quid humanum*: “I will say more: we ought not to believe, no not *Paul himself*, if he speak any thing of his own, or if he speak only as a man.”

Concil. Trid.
sess. 6. [l. 7.
Harduin. x.
55.]

And to increase the uncertainty hereof, the whole weight and judgment of *councils* hangeth now evermore upon the *pope*: as it may appear by these words of the conclusion of the late *chapter at Trident*: *Salva semper in omnibus sedis apostolicæ autoritate*: “The authority of the apostolic see in all things evermore reserved.” Whereby it appeareth, that the determination of matters hangeth not of the *council*, but of the *pope*. But Platina saith, as it is alleged before: *Acta priorum pontificum sequentes pontifices semper aut infringunt, aut omnino tollunt*: “The *popes* that follow do evermore either break or wholly abrogate the decrees of the *popes* that were before.” And thus being turned from all other *bishops* unto *councils*, from *councils* to the *pope*, and from one *pope* to another, we shall evermore build upon sand and uncertainty, and never be assured where to stand.

Platina in
Stephano.
[vi.]

“Whether the scripture be well alleged, or otherwise, thereof” (ye say) “the people may not judge. For Christ saith, *The scholar is not above his master.*” Certainly, M. Harding, the simplest of all the people, notwithstanding, by your restraint, he may not judge of the *scriptures*, yet he may easily judge of you, either that ye understand not, or that ye unadvisedly abuse the *scriptures*. “Whether it be the word of God or no, the people” (ye say) “may not judge.” And that ye prove even by the *scriptures*, God knoweth, full handsomely and full discreetly applied. “For the scholar” (ye say) “is not above his master.” Thus we may learn by the *logic of Louvain*, that

populus is Latin for a *scholar* : and that *scripture* is Latin for a *master*. And thus by your vain premises without sense, ye proceed vainly, and conclude nothing.

O, M. Harding, have some regard to that ye write. The simplest may soon espy your doings. Ye can no longer thus mock the world with shows of words. Christ spake not these words of the understanding of the *scriptures* ; but of persecution for the *scriptures*. Mark well the place. Thus the words lie together : “ When they shall persecute you in one city, flee into another, &c. *The scholar is not* Matt. x. 24. *above his master : nor the servant above his lord*. If they have called the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more will they so call his household servants !”

Alas, where learned you to frame such arguments, *The apostles being the scholars, can no more escape persecution than could Christ that was the Master* : Ergo, *The people cannot understand what they read in the Scriptures* ? Here is neither *antecedent*, nor *consequent*, nor *sequel* in reason. For the honour of the university, have better regard unto your logic. Ye bewray the weakness of your cause, when ye so slenderly abuse the *scriptures*.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 22. *Divis.* 4.

Chrysostom saith : “ *There be many oftentimes,* [Chrysost. de Sanct. et Ador. Spiritu. iii. 807, 808.] *which boast themselves of the Holy Ghost :.....but truly whoso speak of their own head do falsely boast that they have the Spirit of God.....For like as*” (saith he) “ *Christ denied he spake of himself, when he spake out of the law and prophets, even so now, if any thing be pressed upon us in the name of the Holy Ghost, save the gospel, we ought not to believe it..... For as Christ is the fulfilling of the law and prophets, so is the Holy Ghost the fulfilling of the gospel*”⁶.” Thus far goeth Chrysostom.

⁶ [Saville, as well as the Bened., but thinks it may be assigned to considers this treatise not to be a some writer of perhaps equal antiquity.]

M. HARDING.

They allege out of Chrysostom, that whosoever speak of their own do untruly attribute to themselves the Spirit of God. But they remember not, how they who are gathered together in the name of Christ do not speak of their own, because Christ, who is the truth, hath promised to be in the midst of them. Now if they tell us, that the fathers at Trent were not gathered together in the name of Christ, how much more truly may we reply to them, that the temporal men (assembled together at Auspurg, at Marpurg, at Wormes, at Smalcald, at Baden, at Westminster, or any where else) came not together in the name of Christ?..... I require but a man of common sense to sit judge in this cause. They cannot possibly bring any thing out of the scriptures, or ancient fathers, for maintenance of this their great case.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Ye build over boldly, M. Harding, on Christ's *promises*. God is true, whatsoever he promise: but oftentimes men are false. Christ hath promised to be present wheresoever two or three be gathered together in his name. But it appeareth by the words of the prophet David, "that councils oftentimes meet together against God, and against his Christ." The prophet Michaëas saith: *Sic dicit Dominus de prophetis, qui errare faciunt populum meum:.....Abominantur iudicium, et omne rectum pervertunt:.....Super Dominum requiescebant, dicentes, Nunquid non est Dominus in medio nostri?* "Thus saith our Lord of the prophets that deceive my people: They abhor judgment: they overthrow all that is right: and yet they rest themselves upon our Lord, saying, Is not our Lord in the midst amongst us?"

Psal. li. 2.
Acts iv. 26.

Mic. iii. 5.
9. 11.

This is your defence, M. Harding. Whether the word of God be with you or against you, yet ye say, "ye have still the Spirit of God, and our Lord himself is in the midst amongst you." But this boldness, by Chrysostom's judgment, is presumptuous and dangerous. And therefore his counsel is, that if any thing be pressed upon us by the name of the *Holy Ghost*, saving only the gospel of Christ, we should not believe it. In like sense St. Augustine saith: *Sua illi si docere velint, nolite audire: nolite*

Chrysost. de
Sanct. et
Ador. Spirit.
[lii. 807, 808.]

August. in
Johan. tract.
46. [lii. pt. 2.
604.]

facere: “If they bring any decree or phantasy of their own, hear it not: do it not.”

Thus the old frantic and fanatical *heretics*, when they found themselves convinced by the evident testimonies of *God's word*, they appealed to the *Spirit of God*: which they said, even as you say, evermore assisted them, and could not fail them. Hereof St. Augustine writeth thus:

Videtur ergo, id vos agere, ut omnis de medio scripturarum

August. contra Faust.
Manich. lib.
32. cap. 19.
[viii. 461.]

authoritas auferatur: et suus cuique animus auctor sit, quid in quaque scriptura probet, quid improbet: id est, ut non auctoritati scripturarum subjiciatur ad fidem, sed sibi scripturas ipse subjiciat: non ut ideo illi placeat aliquid, quia hoc in sublimi auctoritate scriptum legitur: sed ideo recte scriptum videatur, quia hoc illi placuit: “Ye see, therefore, this is your drift, that all authority of the *scriptures* be removed: that each man may be led by his own phantasy, what he list, either to allow in the holy *scriptures*, or to disallow: that is to say, that he submit not himself, touching his faith, to the authority of the *scriptures*, but that he make the *scriptures* subject unto him: not that he will allow any thing, because it is written in that high authority of the *scriptures*; but that he will think it well written, because he alloweth it.” By means hereof

it cometh to pass, that St. Hilary writeth: *Qui quæ scripta sunt negas, quid superest, [leg. restat] nisi, ut quæ non scripta sunt probes?* “Forasmuch as thou deniest the things that be written, what remaineth there, but that thou must allow the things that be not written?”

Hilar. de Trinitate, lib. 9.
[p. 1005,
1006.]

Concerning the authority and credit of *councils*, we shall have cause to say more hereafter. But where ye require *but a man of common sense* to sit as judge in this cause, it appeareth, that either ye remember not, or else ye weigh not, that ye immediately said before. For in this self-same chapter ye say: “The people may not judge of their bishops.” And that, as ye tell us, by Christ's own doctrine: “*For the scholar is not above his master.*” Yet now suddenly, as having forgotten your own words, ye call forth the *scholar*, yea, and as it may be thought, one of the

meanest of all your *school*, as a *man only endued* with common sense, to sit in judgment over his *master*.

Acts x. 34.

Notwithstanding, God is no acceptor of persons. God's *Holy Spirit* is not bound to *councils* or companies: but breatheth freely where it listeth. And therefore, as your own doctor Panormitane saith, in cases of *religion*, the judgment of one simple plain man ought sometimes to be received before the judgment of the *pope*.

John iii. 8.
Extr. de
Elect. et Ele-
cti potestat.
Significast.
Abb. [Pa-
norm. tom. i.
l. pt. i. fol.
122. col. i.]

Here endeth the Fourth Part.

END OF VOL. V.